

FIRST AVENUE HOTEL, High Holborn, W.C. LONDON.

THE MOST CONVENIENT HOTEL FOR
SOLICITORS AND CLIENTS VISITING LONDON.

Opposite Chancery-lane, and a few doors from
"Tube" Station. Close to all the Inns of Court and
the Law Courts. Offers real comfort at most moderate
charges. Inclusive terms from 12/- per day. GARAGE.

Telegrams: "Firavtel, London."

GORDON HOTELS, LIMITED.

LAW REVERSIONARY INTEREST SOCIETY, LIMITED.

THANET HOUSE, 231-232, STRAND LONDON, W.C.

(OPPOSITE THE LAW COURTS).

REMOVED FROM No. 24, LINCOLN'S INN FIELDS, W.C.
ESTABLISHED 1853.

Capital Stock ... £400,000
Debenture Stock ... £278,130

REVERSIONS BOUGHT. LOANS MADE THEREON.

Proposal Forms and full information may be had at the Society's Office,
W. OSCAR NASH, F.I.A., Actuary and Secretary.

IMPORTANT TO SOLICITORS

In Drawing LEASES or MORTGAGES of
LICENSED PROPERTY
To see that the Insurance Covenants include a policy covering the risk of
LOSS OR FORFEITURE OF THE LICENSE.

Suitable clauses, settled by Counsel, can be obtained on application to
THE LICENSES INSURANCE CORPORATION AND
GUARANTEE FUND, LIMITED,
24, MOORGATE STREET, LONDON, E.C.

Mortgages on Licensed Properties Guaranteed promptly.

LEGAL AND GENERAL LIFE ASSURANCE SOCIETY.

ESTABLISHED 1836.

10, FLEET STREET, LONDON.

FREE,
SIMPLE,

THE
PERFECTED
OF
LIFE
ASSURANCE.

AND
SECURE.

FUNDS - £4,700,000. INCOME - £610,000.
YEARLY BUSINESS - £2,594,000. BUSINESS IN FORCE - £18,000,000

TRUSTEES.

The Right Hon. The Earl of HALSBURY.
The Hon. Mr. Justice KEENEWICH.
His Honour Judge BACON.
WILLIAM WILLIAMS, Esq., J.P.
RICHARD PENNINGTON, Esq., J.P.

DIRECTORS.

Bacon, His Honour Judge.
Davey, The Right Hon. Lord.
Deane, The Hon. Mr. Justice.
Ellis-Danvers, Edmund Henry, Esq.
Finch, Arthur J., Esq.
Frere, Geo. Edgar, Esq.
Hesley, C. E. H. Chadwyck, Esq., O.B.,
K.C.
Johnson, Charles P., Esq.
Ketewich, The Hon. Mr. Justice.
Masterman, Henry Chauncy, Esq.

Mathew, The Right Hon. Sir J. C.
Meek, A. Grant, Esq., J.P. (Devizes).
Mellor, The Right Hon. John W., K.C.
Morrell, Frederic P., Esq. (Oxford).
Pennington, Richard, Esq., J.P.
Rawle, Thomas, Esq.
Saltwell, Wm. Henry, Esq.
Tweddle, R. W., Esq.
Williams, Homer, Esq., J.P., D.L.
Williams, William, Esq.

The Solicitors' Journal and Weekly Reporter.

LONDON, DECEMBER 15, 1906.

*. The Editor cannot undertake to return rejected contributions, and
copies should be kept of all articles sent by writers who are not on
the regular staff of the JOURNAL.

All letters intended for publication must be authenticated by the name
of the writer.

Contents.

CURRENT TOPICS	107	LAW STUDENTS' JOURNAL	116
THE PRIORITIES OF DEBENTURES AND GARNISHED DEBTS	110	LEGAL NEWS	117
THE AUSTRALIAN CONSTITUTION AND THE PRIVY COUNCIL	111	COURT PAPERS	118
REVIEWS	112	WINDING-UP NOTICES	118
SOCIETIES	118	CREDITORS' NOTICES	119
		BANKRUPTCY NOTICES	120

Cases Reported this Week.

Adams, Re. Verrier v. Haskins	113
Cooper (Surveyor of Taxes) v. Rev. D. Y. Barkston	114
Henry Leatham & Sons (Lim.) and Others v. Johnstone-White	113
Piercy (Deceased), Re. Whittham v. Piercy	113
Rex v. Justices of Carmarthenshire. Ex parte William John	114
Wood Green Urban District Council v. Joseph	112
W. S. Jerome, A Solicitor, Re	114

Current Topics.

The Long Vacation.

It is understood that a meeting of the judges has been
summoned for the 11th of January to consider the proposal that
the Long Vacation shall commence on the 1st of August and
end on the 12th October. The change, if recommended, will be
made by Order in Council.

The Meeting of the Requisitionists and the Council of the Law Society.

WE BELIEVE that the Council of the Law Society still insist
on the meeting to which we referred last week being held in
private, and we cannot learn that any official statement as to the
results of the deliberations will be furnished by the Council.
We venture to think that this is a somewhat mistaken course,
since nothing is more certain than that accounts, more or less in-
correct, of the proceedings will find their way into the papers.

A Novel Trade-mark.

AFTER CONSIDERABLE negotiation with the Board of Trade,
the Trade Mark of the Irish Industrial Development Association
of Cork was registered on Saturday last. The Trade Mark
consists mainly of the device of an ancient Irish ornament
having within it the words "Déanta i nEirinn," which, being
interpreted, mean "Made in Ireland." This Trade Mark, which,
we believe, is the first general Trade Mark registered under
section 62 of the Trade Marks Act, 1905, is intended to be used
as a certificate that goods of any kind on which it appears are
goods of Irish origin.

Length of a Case Before the Official Referees.

MUCH HAS been said of late about the increasing length of
trials in the Superior Courts, and from what we have heard this
deliberation in procedure appears to be extending to the sub-
sidiary tribunals. In a case before one of the Official Referees,
relating to the repairs of a ship, the hearing has already occu-
pied sixteen days, and it is not impossible that it may occupy as
many more. The business of the present day has become so
complicated that much of it cannot be conveniently digested and
summarized in a law court. The ingenuity of the Legislature
must at some future period devise an effective mode of narrowing
the area of discussion in a modern lawsuit. Special pleading
has become obsolete, and so far there is nothing to take its
place.

Unqualified Advocates.

M. CHENU, the batonnier of the bar of Paris, referred in his recent address to certain resolutions, of which notice had been given in the Chamber of Deputies, respecting the right to appear as advocate in different tribunals. It was proposed by these resolutions that priests, military and naval officers, physicians, and persons holding posts in the Government offices should, under certain conditions, be admitted to appear as advocates. M. CHENU had little difficulty in shewing that the persons referred to would often find great incompatibility between their ordinary duties and those of an advocate. The only approach in this country to such a change as that suggested in France is in the somewhat crude sections of the Factory Acts. The Factory and Workshop Act, 1901, s. 21, enacts that, where a death has occurred by accident in a factory, any relative of the deceased person, and any inspector and any occupier of the factory in which the accident occurred, and any person appointed by the order in writing of the majority of the work-people employed in the factory, shall be at liberty to attend at the inquest and in person, or by agent, to examine any witness. We cannot but think that the introduction of unprofessional advocates into the coroner's court is calculated to increase the difficulty of maintaining order and method in what is in the nature of a judicial inquiry.

The Expenses of an Inquiry Under the Lunacy Acts.

MR. FISCHER, the Master in Lunacy, is not satisfied with the administration of that department of the law. He is of opinion that the fact that there is no permanent Judge in Lunacy is fatal to any continuity of practice. He points out that the expense of any contentious business under the present system is ruinous, and refers to the cases of *Mrs. CATHCART* and *LORD TOWNSHEND*. More than forty years have passed since the case of *MR. WYNDHAM* excited the attention of the public and occupied a fair share of the columns of the daily newspapers. The late *MR. SAMUEL WARREN*, the presiding Master in Lunacy, commented on the enormous expense of the trial with his usual command of language; but the counsel were eminent; the case went on; and when a verdict was finally pronounced in favour of *MR. WYNDHAM*, the amount left for this unfortunate young man and his satellites was materially reduced. The suggestion that a new Lunacy Act should enact that there should be a permanent Judge in Lunacy who should exercise all the powers conferred on the Lunacy Judge and the Masters in Lunacy may be a good one, but we do not at present see how it would reduce the expenses of litigation. There is no talk of the abolition of trial by jury, and a case of "public interest" is pretty sure to be long and expensive.

The Composition of the House of Lords as a Court of Appeal.

THE APPEAL in the case of *Rex v. West Riding of Yorkshire County Council* has been argued before what *MR. SAMUEL PEPPYS* would have called "a brave assembly" of legal peers, no fewer than eight of their lordships being present. The questions raised in the case are interesting and important, but they turn, after all, upon the construction of a recent statute, and it is curious to observe that points of much greater difficulty were determined in 1853 by the House of Lords in the celebrated *Braintree case* (*Gosling v. Veley*, 4 H. L. Cas. 679), the House consisting only of Lord TRURO (who had taken part in the judgment from which error was brought) and Lord BROUGHAM, who simply concurred, without giving any reasons for his concurrence. We cannot believe that one, or even two, peers would at the present day venture to reverse the carefully-considered decisions of the superior courts of justice, but it should be remembered that in the earlier part of the reign of the late Queen the practice of summoning the judges of the High Court to assist the House by their opinions had by no means been abandoned. Besides the common law judges, the Master of the Rolls, the Attorney-General, the Solicitor-General, and the King's Serjeants were also bound to attend when required, being summoned as assistants to the House of Lords at the opening of each Parliament in the same way as the judges were. In 1693 the Lord Keeper SOMERS rebuked the

judges for their gross negligence in attendance, and told them that if their fault were not amended, the House would proceed with great severity against them. But our judges are at the present day so occupied with their ordinary duties that their office as assistants of the House has become a sinecure.

Solicitors' Charging Orders.

THE RIGHT of a solicitor to have his costs paid out of property which he has been instrumental in preserving or recovering in an action is founded upon an obvious equity, and it is recognized by section 28 of the Solicitors Act, 1860, which empowers the court before which the action is heard to declare the solicitor to be entitled to a charge upon it for his taxed costs in reference to the action. But this is a power which the court can exercise or not at its discretion, and in the recent case of *Re Turner* (*ante*, p. 101) *KEKEWICH, J.*, held that the solicitor's claim to have his costs thus secured must give way to the claim of trustees for their costs, charges, and expenses. In that case an action for the administration of an estate was commenced and then compromised, with the result that, while some property was "preserved," it was not sufficient to pay the costs both of the plaintiffs' solicitors and of the trustees of the estate. The taxed costs of the solicitors were £364, and the taxed costs, charges, and expenses of the trustees were £402. The claim of trustees to be reimbursed all expenses incurred by them in connection with the trust has been always recognized by the courts, and this is only a natural set-off to the strictness with which trustees have been held liable to account for the trust funds. On the other hand it is, as was pointed out by *BOWEN, L.J.*, in *Greer v. Young* (24 Ch. D., p. 557), discretionary with the court whether it will make an order in favour of the solicitor under the statute. "The solicitor," said the learned Lord Justice, "has no absolute right to the charge, but only power to ask the court, in the exercise of its discretion, to make the charge." In the present case *KEKEWICH, J.*, decided, upon these considerations, that the solicitors ought to be postponed to the trustees. The right of trustees, he said, to their costs was of the largest character, and it was important that they should have full reimbursement, so that persons might be found to act as trustees and to give their services gratuitously.

The Plural Voting Bill.

BY THE rejection by the House of Lords of the Plural Voting Prevention Bill, one of the clumsiest pieces of attempted legislation on record has for the time disappeared. It is quite possible, however, that it may again be brought to light. Its object was to prevent any man registered as a voter in several constituencies from voting in respect of more than one of his qualifications in any one year—and as to this object we have no observations to offer. But the Bill sought to attain its objects in the most vexatious, roundabout, and confused manner it is possible to conceive; and in a manner which would be extremely costly and would throw a vast amount of work on clerks of county councils and town clerks. There are eight pages in the Bill, while its professed object might be effected in one or two. There is a most elaborate machinery requiring a voter to select, before the 5th of September in any year, the constituency for which he desires to vote, and in that one alone can he vote. It may be, of course, that later in September, when the Revision Courts are held, his name may be struck off the list for the particular constituency he has selected; or he may be registered in two different constituencies without being aware of the fact; in such cases he is disfranchised altogether unless he goes to the expense and trouble of applying to a court of justice for leave to make a selection. According to the Bill, if he forgets to make a selection (as he very likely may in the middle of his summer holiday) he is forbidden to vote at all, although he may be registered in several constituencies. The Bill would clearly have the effect of entirely disfranchising a very large number of persons merely because they are qualified for the franchise in more than one place. The ordinary owner or householder has become accustomed to find his name on the register without it being necessary for him to take any trouble whatever. Why, because he has a shop in a borough and a house in a county, should he have to take a definite step before he can vote at all?

De
It see
object
quarte
any m
under
one a
voter
of bus
many
owner
at, an
abolish
only te
gratifi
of pro
itself,
registr
Marr
Few
to the
differ
matter
the lay
formed
(2 Sw.
and the
parties
many a
De Bar
light o
the par
each co
its crea
(3 P. D
both
it was
by virtu
under t
pensation
to marr
Court o
judgme
in the s
the jud
that a d
difficult
marriage
quence o
latter.
both the
domicile
marriage
was in f
the husb
(5 P. D.
circumst
he pron
on a d
The sam
(Times,
An Engl
in Engla
was not
that law
validity
In 1901
the wom
ceremony
however,
the form
with the
marriage
domicile,
Consequ
decreed a

It seems absurd. We venture to assert that the proposed object of the Bill might be attained by a document one quarter its length. It would be quite sufficient to forbid any man to vote in one year for more than one constituency under pain of a penalty. Then let him vote in more than one at his peril. There are a very large number of dual voters in the country—men who have one vote for their places of business and another for their residences. There are also many men who have each got many votes in respect of the ownership of property. If the real pluralists are those aimed at, and not the dualists, it would be quite sufficient to simply abolish the ownership qualification, and make occupation the only test. Quite apart from any political considerations, we are gratified to see the extinction of an absolutely unworkable piece of proposed legislation. The question irresistibly suggests itself, does any member of Parliament know anything about registration?

Marriage and Domicil.

FEW QUESTIONS present greater difficulty than those relating to the validity of a marriage contracted between parties of different nationalities. If marriage were regarded purely as a matter of contract, then it would be easy to refer its validity to the law of the country where the marriage ceremony is performed, and authority for this is to be found in *Simonin v. Mallac* (2 Sw. & Tr. 67). But this view of marriage has not prevailed, and the courts have paid regard also to the personal status of the parties as determined by the country of their domicil. "Very many and serious difficulties," said HANNEN, P., in *Sottomayer v. De Barros* (5 P. D. 94), "arise if marriage be regarded only in the light of a contract. It is, indeed, based upon the contract of the parties, but it is a status arising out of a contract to which each country is entitled to attach its own conditions, both as to its creation and duration." In an earlier stage of that litigation (3 P. D. 1), when it was supposed that the parties, who were both Portuguese, were also both domiciled in Portugal, it was held that their marriage in England was invalidated by virtue of the Portuguese law. They were first cousins, and under that law such a marriage is unlawful without a papal dispensation. They were accordingly under a personal incapacity to marry, and of this the English court took notice. But the Court of Appeal, in so deciding, were careful to confine their judgment to the case where the two parties were both domiciled in the same country. "It was," said COTTON, L.J., in delivering the judgment of the court, "pressed upon us in argument that a decision in favour of the petitioner would lead to many difficulties if questions should arise as to the validity of a marriage between an English subject and a foreigner in consequence of prohibitions imposed by the law of the domicil of the latter. Our opinion on this subject is confined to the case where both the contracting parties are, at the time of their marriage, domiciled in a country the laws of which prohibit their marriage." On further inquiry in that case it appeared that it was in fact not within the judgment of the Court of Appeal, as the husband was proved to have become domiciled in England (5 P. D. 94), and it was held by HANNEN, P., that under such circumstances the law of England applied, and consequently he pronounced valid the marriage which the Court of Appeal, on a different view of the facts, had pronounced invalid. The same question has arisen in the case of *Ogden v. Ogden* (*Times*, 11th inst.), just decided by BARGRAVE DEANE, J. An Englishwoman, domiciled in England, was, in 1898, married in England to a Frenchman domiciled in France. The husband was not of full age according to French law, and according to that law the permission of his parents was necessary for the validity of the marriage. This permission was not obtained. In 1901 the marriage was dissolved by the French courts, and the woman, who had remained in England, went through the ceremony of marriage again in this country. It has been held, however, that the French decree did not touch the validity of the former marriage in this country, and that, in accordance with the second decision in *Sottomayer v. De Barros* (*supra*), that marriage was valid here. The parties being of different domicils, the *lex loci contractus* prevailed over the *lex domicilii*. Consequently the second marriage was null, and the court decreed accordingly.

Military Manœuvres and the Law of Trespass.

IN AN article on "Military Manœuvres and the Law of Trespass" in *Macmillan's Magazine*, Captain FETHERSTONHAUGH complains that the law of trespass seriously interferes with the higher training of the army. He reminds us that in the recent manœuvres in the neighbourhood of Chichester the Aldershot army corps was not allowed to entrench, though in practice the spade is used almost as much as the rifle; and that the marking of fields of roots and pheasant coverts as "out of bounds" was a serious impediment to the proper disposition of the troops. He maintains that the unrestricted use of the land is every whit as essential to the training of the army as the unrestricted use of the sea is essential to the training of the navy. The conclusion is that the Manœuvres Act, 1897, which defines areas; prevents the same area being used more than once in five years, and provides for compensation for damages, does not go far enough, for proprietors can still deny the use of much of their land. It should be beyond the power of anybody to put more than his garden out of bounds. Captain FETHERSTONHAUGH considers that this would be no real hardship to the landed interest, inasmuch as the amount of damage done by troops is very much exaggerated in the anticipations of landlords, and that sport (at present a far greater obstacle than the fears of farmers) damages land much more than troops do. These views are, of course, entitled to fair consideration. It is not easy to forecast the changes which may be made in the organization of the British Army, and a time may come when the necessity for proper training fields may compel those interested in sporting rights to make some sacrifice for the public convenience. But the right claimed in the article referred to can never be exercised except under the authority of the Legislature, with suitable provisions for compensation to the persons whose property may be appropriated or injured.

Compensation for Personal Injuries.

IN AN article in one of the monthly periodicals, called "Curiosities of Compensation," the writer dwells on the inequalities of our law as shewn by the widely varying sums granted in compensation for accidents, the nature of which are exactly similar. For example, a workman in the employ of the British Electric Co. while working a revolving brush, received such injuries that one of his eyes had to be removed. The court granted £150 compensation. A few months later a Northumberland miner was awarded only £120 for an exactly similar injury. A basket-maker was entering a train at Plumstead when it started with a jerk and he was thrown on the metals and his left hand was so crushed by the wheels that it had to be amputated. He recovered £319 10s. from the South-Eastern and Chatham Railway Co. Not long afterwards, a Handsworth woman had a similar accident on the cable trams in that town which resulted in the loss of her left arm. In her case the compensation was £700, more than double that received by the basket-maker, though his injury deprived him of the power of earning his livelihood. It is easy to call attention to this apparent disparity in the awards of compensation, but the writer can hardly expect us to assume that in each case the age and occupation of the plaintiff; his earnings, and the likelihood of his remaining in permanent employment were the same. It is part of our system that the amount of damages should be the result of a compromise among jurors of different opinions, and we ought really to be surprised that there is not a larger disproportion between the amounts awarded under similar circumstances.

Imprisonment of Barristers in a Robing Room.

WE beg to offer the barristers and solicitors who were, by the malicious act of some person unknown, locked up for nearly two hours in the robing room of the Clerkenwell County Court our respectful sympathy. Many persons who upon some occasion in their lives have found that the only door in the room which they propose to leave refuses to be opened, will appreciate the uncomfortable situation of the learned gentlemen, and if the robing room in question resembles other robing rooms with which we are acquainted, their discomfort must have been sensibly aggravated. We are not told whether the locksmith who was summoned found it necessary, according to the usage

among his fraternity, to go back in search of his tools. He seems, at any rate, to have been unable to open the door from the outside and to have followed the time-honoured fashion of entering the window by means of a ladder. We fully accept the opinion of the learned judge that the imprisonment of those in the robing room was a contempt of court, and must express our astonishment that anyone, not having any fear of the profession before his eyes, should have been guilty of so heinous an offence.

Liability of Landlord for Earwigs.

A CASE of some novelty has recently been tried in the Yarmouth County Court. The defendant, who had taken a house in Norfolk, defended an action for rent, his ground of defence being that the premises were unfit for comfortable occupation owing to the presence of an extraordinary number of earwigs. The judge overruled this defence, on the ground that the earwigs were no more a permanent nuisance than an unusual number of wasps or mosquitoes, for which the landlord could not be held responsible. When it is remembered that our courts have shewn great unwillingness to admit a similar defence in the case of insects of a still more disagreeable character, we cannot be surprised that the county court judge should have some hesitation in carrying their decision any further.

The Priorities of Debentures and Garnished Debts.

THE decision of WALTON, J., in the recent case of *Cairney v. Back* (1906, 2 K. B. 746) is an interesting addition to the authorities on the respective priorities of debenture-holders and execution creditors. *Prima facie* debenture-holders come in front of execution creditors in consequence of the rule that such creditors take subject to all equities (*Re Standard Manufacturing Co.*, 39 W. R. 389; 1891, 1 Ch., at p. 641), and this priority seems to prevail over any process issued by the execution creditor unless, possibly, it has resulted in the actual receipt by the creditor of assets of the company in satisfaction of his debt. This was the case in *Robson v. Smith* (43 W. R. 632; 1895, 2 Ch. 118), where a garnishee order had been made absolute, and the garnished debt had been paid to the garnishor before any receiver had been appointed on behalf of the debenture-holder, though the debtor had notice of the debenture. The debenture-holder sued the debtor to recover payment of the amount on the ground that it been improperly paid to the garnishor, but ROMER, J., rejected the claim. This was upon the ground that, until the debenture-holder intervened, the company was to be treated as continuing to carry on its business, and the receipt of the garnished debt by the garnishor was a receipt of assets of the company while the debentures still remained only a floating security.

But if the garnishor has not actually obtained payment of the garnished debt, it seems that his diligence gives him no priority over the debenture-holders, and, upon their intervening, all the assets, including the garnished debt, belong to them. This rule was laid down with regard to execution creditors generally in *Davey & Co. v. Williamson & Sons* (46 W. R. 571; 1898, 2 Q. B. 194). "The rights of the execution creditor," said Lord RUSSELL, C.J., "are subject, not only to the legal, but also to the equitable, rights of the debenture-holders. The sheriff cannot merely by seizing affect the rights of third persons to which property was subject when in the hands of the debtor, unless, indeed, such third persons have debarred themselves from the assertion of such rights." And the rule was in that case held to apply so as to prevent the execution creditor, from obtaining priority, notwithstanding that the debenture holders had not actually intervened. The seizure of the company's effects by the sheriff was not a dealing with them in the ordinary course of business, and it did not remove the goods from the scope of the charge created by the debentures. And upon the same principle it may be that even after a sale by the sheriff, and the payment of the proceeds to the execution creditor, he would remain liable to refund the amount to the debenture-holders, notwithstanding *Robson v. Smith* (*supra*); although if there has been no actual realization of the goods, but a pay-

ment by the company to the sheriff for the purpose of avoiding realization, the judgment creditor would be under no such liability: *Robinson v. Burnell's Vienna Bakery Co. (Limited)* (52 W. R. 526; 1904, 2 K. B. 624).

In regard to garnished debts the question has been raised whether the garnishee order has the effect of transferring the garnished debt to the garnishor so as to remove it from the assets of the company. Even if this were so it does not follow that it would also be withdrawn from the scope of the debenture charge, for, as with any other execution, it would not be a dealing with the assets in the ordinary course of business. But in fact the garnishing of the debt does not operate as a transfer of it. If so, the garnishor would become a creditor of the garnishee, and it was held in *Re Combined Weighing and Advertising Machine Co.* (38 W. R. 67, 43 Ch. D. 99) that this was not the case. "What," said COTTON, L.J., there, "does a garnishee order do? It is not an assignment of the debt due by the garnishee to the debtor; it merely gives the garnishor a lien upon that debt." And consequently the lien in favour of the garnishor is subject to any prior equitable charges to which the garnished debt is subject. Hence, a garnishee order *nisi* does not give priority over debenture-holders who do not intervene by the appointment of a receiver until after the order has been made. In *Norton v. Yates* (54 W. R. 183; 1906, 1 K. B. 112) a garnishee order *nisi* was made on the 17th of January, 1905, and on the 19th of January an order was made in a debenture-holders' action appointing a receiver. It was held by WARRINGTON, J., that the debenture-holders were entitled in priority to the garnishor. In accordance with *Re Combined Weighing and Advertising Machine Co.* (*supra*) he pointed out that the debt was not transferred by the garnishee order, and that the priority of the debenture-holders was not displaced. "The debt remains the property of the judgment debtor, and such right as the garnishor has over it is subject to all the rights and equities attaching to it in the judgment debtor's hands." Moreover, although the assets are not, so long as the debentures "float," subject to a specific charge in favour of the debenture-holders, yet, as the learned judge further held, they are subject to a general charge which prevents a prior charge being created. So soon as the debenture-holders claim the property, this general charge becomes a specific charge and has the same priority as the previous general charge. "Debentures create a general charge capable of becoming a specific charge on the happening of certain specific events, but a charge existing before the happening of those events."

In the present case of *Cairney v. Back* (*supra*) the garnishee order had been made absolute before the appointment of a receiver by the debenture-holders, but WALTON, J., held that this had no effect in excluding their priority. On the 15th of June, 1906, a creditor of the Consolidated Mines (Limited) obtained judgment; and on the same day he served a garnishee order *nisi* on the company's bank to attach the balance of their current account, which exceeded the amount of his debt. On the 25th of June the order was made absolute, and on the 29th of June a receiver was appointed on behalf of a debenture-holder of the company. The bank paid the money into court, and an issue was directed to determine the title to it. It seems, however, that the principle which has been stated above applies equally whether the garnishee order is *nisi* or absolute. It depends upon the consideration that the order does not operate as a transfer of the debt, and in *Re Combined Weighing and Advertising Machine Co. (Limited)*, where this was laid down, the garnishee order had in fact been made absolute. WALTON, J., accordingly pointed out that it would have made no difference in *Norton v. Yates* (*supra*) if the garnishee order in that case had been made absolute before the receiver was appointed. Moreover, the making the order absolute does not carry the case as far as *Robson v. Smith* (*supra*), where the debt had actually been paid to the garnishor, even if that can be treated as a decision in favour of the garnishor. But the decision was in favour of the garnishee and not of the garnishor, and it does not follow that the garnishor would be allowed to retain as against the debenture-holder the money so received. There is, indeed, sufficient uncertainty still left about the rights of the various parties interested under such circumstances to suggest that we are by no means at the end of the decisions on the subject. It seems,

however, for the present to be settled that a garnishee who has obtained an order absolute, but has not received payment under it, does not thereby acquire any priority over debenture-holders.

The Australian Constitution and the Privy Council.

THE case of *Webb v. Outtrim* (Respondent) and the Commonwealth of Australia (Intervenant), reported in the *Times* of the 7th of December, raises questions of extraordinary interest with respect to the constitution of the Commonwealth of Australia, and the relations between the Judicial Committee and the High Court of Australia. The judgment of the Privy Council is given upon an appeal from the Supreme Court of Victoria, and decides (reversing the court below) that income tax in the State of Victoria is payable by officers of the Commonwealth—in the present case a Deputy Postmaster-General. The history and circumstances of the case must be given somewhat fully in order to understand its importance.

In 1904 the Supreme Court of Victoria had decided that the official salary of a federal officer (in that case a member of the House of Representatives and a Minister of the Crown in the Commonwealth Government) was chargeable with income tax under an Act of the State Legislature: *Re The Income Tax Acts, Deakin's and Lyne's cases* (29 V. L. R. 748). From this decision the taxpayers appealed to the High Court of Australia, and the High Court reversed the judgment of the State Court and decided that the official salary of a federal officer residing in Victoria is not chargeable with income tax under the State Income Tax Acts: *Deakin v. Webb* (1904, 1 Commonwealth L. R. 586). From this decision the State Commissioner of Taxes (WEBB) desired to appeal to the Privy Council, and applied to the High Court for a certificate giving him leave to appeal, as required by section 74 of the Australian Constitution. Section 74 provides that "no appeal shall be permitted to the Queen in Council from a decision of the High Court upon any question, howsoever arising, as to the limits *inter se* of the constitutional powers of the Commonwealth and those of any State . . . unless the High Court shall certify that the question is one which ought to be determined by her Majesty in Council." The High Court refused the application for a certificate by way of leave to appeal. The decision of the High Court of Australia—that a federal officer's official salary was not taxable under the State Income Tax Acts—was therefore the decision of a final court of appeal, and might be supposed to have become the law of the land until altered by legislation.

But one peculiar and inconvenient feature of the Australian Federal Constitution is that, whilst appeals lie from the State Courts to the High Court of Australia, and in some cases the decision of the Federal Court is final, appeals still lie—as before federation—from the State Courts to the Privy Council. It seems to have occurred to the State authorities in Victoria that, by bringing before the State Court a case precisely similar to *Deakin's case*, and (the State Court being, of course, bound by the Federal Court's decision in *Deakin v. Webb*) appealing from the State Court directly to the Privy Council, the decision of the Privy Council might be obtained upon the very question with respect to which the Federal Court had refused leave to appeal. This is precisely what has now happened. The Supreme Court of Victoria did, in *Re Income Tax Acts, Outtrim's case*, follow the High Court's decision, as they were bound to do, and judgment was given in favour of the taxpayer and against the State Commissioner of Taxes; the Commissioner (WEBB) applied for leave to appeal to the Privy Council, and—the taxpayer OUTTRIM not opposing the application—leave to appeal was granted: 1905, V. L. R. 463. The appeal to the Privy Council having thus been launched, the possibility of a decision being given by the Privy Council which would conflict with the decision of the High Court, became apparent, and the Commonwealth of Australia petitioned the Privy Council for leave to intervene, and asked that the appeal should not be heard at all, and should be dismissed on the ground of its incompetency. The application that the appeal should not be heard was not acceded to, but the Commonwealth

were allowed to appear as intervening on the hearing of the appeal. The objection of the Commonwealth was overruled, and their petition dismissed with costs, whilst the substantive appeal was allowed (as already stated), but without costs, and the judgment of the Supreme Court of Victoria was reversed. As also stated above, the reversal of the State Court's judgment was in effect the reversal of the decision of the High Court of Australia in *Deakin v. Webb*; this and another similar decision of the High Court were, in fact, disapproved of by the Judicial Committee in the strongest terms.

An extraordinary situation is thus created. Notwithstanding the refusal of the High Court of Australia to give leave to appeal, an appeal has in effect been heard by the Privy Council. On this appeal the Privy Council have expressly disapproved of a decision which under one provision of the constitution is final and unappealable, this being made possible by another provision of the same constitution allowing appeals without restriction from the State Courts. The cause of, and the remedy for, this anomalous state of things are, of course, easy to point out. The cause is the system of double or alternative appeals from the State Courts; the remedy is for the home authorities either to provide—as can easily be done by Order in Council—for the abrogation of the right of appeal to the Privy Council upon questions as to which there is no right of appeal from the High Court of Australia, or to enact that the decision of the Federal Court upon such questions shall be binding even on the Privy Council. It is, however, not so easy to come to a conclusion as to whether the decision of the Privy Council is now binding on the High Court, and as to whether—if it be binding—there is any advantage in substituting the interpretation now placed by the Privy Council on the Australian Constitution for the interpretation which had previously been placed upon the constitution by the High Court of Australia.

The propriety of the High Court of Australia acquiescing in the view taken by the Judicial Committee as against their own view, even on the ground of judicial courtesy and respect, is so evident, and the inconvenience of the Federal Court continuing to take one view of the constitution, whilst the State Courts and the Privy Council take another view, would be so intolerable, that the question of the technical right of the High Court of Australia to have its own decision regarded as the law has no practical value. It is inconceivable that the recent decision of the Judicial Committee should not be taken as binding on all Australian courts. It must be taken that the Privy Council's judgment is binding on the High Court of Australia.

The question of the intrinsic value of the judgment delivered in the appeal may, however, be discussed at greater length. It would have been satisfactory, in a matter of such great importance, to find in the Judicial Committee's judgment—technically the reasons for the report of the board to his Majesty—a fuller statement of the reasoning of the High Court of Australia, and a more direct refutation of that reasoning. Further, the Judicial Committee clearly regarded the appeal as one in which the decisions of the High Court in the two cases of *D'Emden v. Pedder* (1 Commonw. L. R. 91) and *Deakin v. Webb* (1 Commonw. L. R. 585) were under review; yet the facts that the High Court had refused leave to appeal in *Deakin v. Webb*, and that to review the decision in *Deakin v. Webb* really meant hearing an appeal from that decision, notwithstanding the provisions of section 74 of the Constitution, were not referred to in the judgment as reported.

The broad ground on which the Judicial Committee disapproved of the decisions in *D'Emden v. Pedder* and *Deakin v. Webb* was that the United States Constitution is not, on similar questions arising between Federal and State authorities, so closely analogous to the Australian Constitution that the decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States can be accepted as guides to the interpretation of the Australian Constitution; incidentally, the Committee thought too much reliance had been placed on the fact that the United States Constitution was prominently brought before the notice of the convention in Australia which drafted the Constitution. The judgments delivered in the High Court are somewhat unfairly treated by the Judicial Committee's citations of them. The two passages quoted at some length (one from *D'Emden v. Pedder*, the other from *Deakin v. Webb*) are given a prominence which

they do not possess as delivered by the High Court. At p. 113 of the report (*D'Emden v. Pedder*) it is expressly said: "We should be prepared, therefore, if it were necessary, and if we found ourselves unable otherwise to come to a clear conclusion, to accept the doctrines laid down in the judgment of the Supreme Court of the United States . . . as applicable to the interpretation of the Constitution of the commonwealth." The passage from *Deakin v. Webb* (p. 606) occurs in close connection with a consideration of the respective schemes of the American and the Canadian Federation, and the method of distributing legislative functions between Federal and State authorities in the United States scheme is shown to be that which has been followed by the Australian Constitution, the actual words of one provision in the United States Constitution being quoted.

Again, in a case which will assuredly evoke the keenest criticism in Australia, it is not satisfactory that the vital distinction between the unwritten constitution of the United Kingdom as paramount power, and the paper constitutions of the autonomous colonies, should have been overlooked. It is this very fact, that the constitutions conferred on the colonies do so far resemble the United States Constitution—in being written or "paper" constitutions, that justifies the comparison made in the High Court judgments. Nevertheless, it is said by the Judicial Committee, with reference to colonial statutes passed by a colonial legislature (after noticing the Colonial Laws Validity Act, 1865), that upon such a statute being assented to by the Crown "no authority existed by which its validity could be questioned or impeached." This, is, of course, a pure oversight, because at the end of the judgment express reference is made to the possibility of the Australian Federal Legislature passing "an Act outside the power of that federal legislature"; the oversight is particularly unfortunate in the present instance. That this oversight, however, has in some degree influenced the conclusion at which the Judicial Committee arrived seems probable by reason of the further remarks as to the meaning of "unconstitutional." In the case of a subordinate legislature the word may be applied to some statute passed by the legislature which is actually "illegal" as being beyond the powers of that legislature, whilst the Legislature of the United Kingdom could not pass a statute which could be called "illegal" even if unconstitutional; no reference to this distinction is made in the judgment of the Judicial Committee. The right to decide upon the validity of colonial statutes—a right possessed by even colonial courts—is thus stated in *Todd's Parliamentary Government in the Colonies* (p. 220): "The power of interpreting colonial statutes, and of deciding upon their constitutional effect and validity, is a common and inherent right appertaining to all her Majesty's courts of law before which a question arising out of the same could be properly submitted for adjudication."

It cannot but be a matter for regret that the Judicial Committee did not see their way to grant the application of the Commonwealth of Australia as intervenant, and dismiss the appeal on the ground that the "question" had already been the subject of a "decision of the High Court," as to which section 74 of the Constitution declares that "no appeal shall be permitted to the Queen in Council." This would have established a useful precedent, and thus have saved the necessity for some alteration with respect to appeals from the State Courts, which must—either by Order in Council or Act of Parliament—now be made with as little delay as possible.

Reviews.

The Law of Torts.

A TREATISE ON THE LAW OF TORTS; OR, WRONGS AND THEIR REMEDIES. By C. G. ADDISON, Barrister-at-Law. EIGHTH EDITION. Edited by WILLIAM E. GORDON, M.A., and WALTER HUSSEY GRIFFITH, B.A., Barristers-at-Law. Stevens & Sons (Limited).

The editors have made considerable changes in the present edition of "Addison on Torts" with a view to bringing the work into line with the more orderly arrangement of this branch of the law which has been developed since the work was first written. Recent writers have attempted to deduce broad principles out of the host of single instances which formerly had to do duty for the law, and in order to

strengthen the foundations on which "Addison" is laid, the first chapter, which deals with the nature of torts, and other parts of the work have been re-written.

The first chapter contains a very useful summary of the recent decisions on trade union law, but in view of the probable passing of the Trade Disputes Bill of the present session, many of these will soon be out of date. They will continue to be interesting, however, as shewing the point to which the law of employer and workmen had advanced before this new intervention of the Legislature. The chapter on Injuries to Rights of Property states somewhat fully the effect of the Real Property Limitation Acts, by way apparently of leading up to the subject of trespass; but such work, good though it is in itself, is hardly necessary for the subject, and tends to swell unnecessarily the size of the book. For this, however, and for the inclusion of other matter which might be appropriately left to other works, the editors are responsible. They themselves point out how certain subjects, such as the Bankruptcy and Bills of Sale Acts, might with advantage have been omitted, had their mandate permitted them to re-write and not merely re-edit the work.

One subject, however—Negligence—which falls properly under the head of Torts, has had increased prominence given to it in the present edition, and there is now a separate chapter—chapter 8—devoted to it. An interesting matter in this connection is the liability of railway companies for damage resulting from sparks from locomotives, a liability which, as the editors note, has been increased by the Railway Fires Act, 1905, the operation of which, however, is still a year distant. The chapter on Fraud represents a full digest of numerous important decisions of recent years, and the section on Parental Rights has received careful revision both with respect to recent statutory changes—such as the Prevention of Cruelty to Children Act, 1904—and to recent decisions on the custody of children. As a practical guide to the statutory and case law of torts the present edition will be found very reliable and complete.

Books of the Week.

Encyclopedia of the Laws of England; with Forms and Precedents by the Most Eminent Legal Authorities. Second Edition, Revised and Enlarged. Vol. II.: Bankruptcy to Charity Commission. Sweet & Maxwell (Limited); Wm. Green & Sons.

The Power to Regulate Corporations and Commerce: A Discussion of the Existence, Basis, Nature, and Scope of the Common Law of the United States. By FRANK HENDRICK, of the New York Bar. G. P. Putnam's Sons.

An Outline of Local Government and Local Taxation in England and Wales (excluding London). By the late R. S. WRIGHT (sometime a Judge of the High Court of Justice) and HENRY HOBHOUSE. Third Edition. By the Right Hon. HENRY HOBHOUSE, M.P. for East Somerset, 1885-1906, and E. L. FANSHAW, Barrister-at-Law. Sweet & Maxwell (Limited); P. S. King & Son.

CASES OF THE WEEK.

Court of Appeal.

WOOD GREEN URBAN DISTRICT COUNCIL v. JOSEPH. No. 1.
3rd Dec.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT—PUBLIC HEALTH—SEWER—DRAIN—COMPLAINTS AS TO NUISANCES—LIABILITY OF PRIVATE OWNER—SINGLE PRIVATE DRAIN—HOUSES BELONGING TO DIFFERENT OWNERS CONNECTED WITH PUBLIC SEWER BY SINGLE PRIVATE DRAIN—PUBLIC HEALTH ACTS AMENDMENT ACT, 1890 (53 & 54 VICT. c. 59), s. 19.

This was an appeal from a judgment of a Divisional Court (Lord Alverstone, C.J., and Lawrance and Ridley, JJ.) on a case stated by justices. The appellant council sought to recover from the respondent by summary proceedings the cost of certain repairs to an alleged "single private drain" under section 41 of the Public Health Act, 1875, and section 19 of the Public Health Acts Amendment Act, 1890. The respondent was the owner of six houses which formed part of a row of sixteen houses on the east side of Parkhurst-road in the council's district, the remaining ten houses belonging to other owners. The drainage of the sixteen houses was conveyed to a public sewer in Marquis-road, a road entering Parkhurst-road at the north end of the row of houses, by means of a system of pipes arranged as follows: the houses were drained in pairs; each house of each pair was drained by a separate pipe into a pipe common to both houses, and each of such common pipes discharged into a single line of pipes—viz., the alleged "single private drain," which was laid in private ground behind, i.e., on the east of the row of houses and parallel thereto. The drainage of the respondent's houses, therefore, was conveyed to the alleged single private drain first by pipes which were not, and then by pipes which were, common to each pair of such houses, and it was admitted by the council that the pipes which were common to each pair were "sewers" within the meaning of the Public Health Acts. A nuisance

having arisen in the drainage of the houses, the council required the respondent to do certain work to the drains separately draining his six houses, which the respondent did. The council at their own expense did the necessary work to the common pipes, but they claimed to recover from the respondent and the other owners the cost of work done to the alleged "single private drain." The justices dismissed the complaint, but stated, "a case for the opinion of the court. The Divisional Court affirmed the decision of the justices. The council appealed."

THE COURT (COLLINS, M.R., and COZENS-HARDY and FARWELL, L.JJ.) dismissed the appeal.

COLLINS, M.R., said that, assuming that the alleged single private drain was a single private drain, the appellants could not recover from the respondent the cost of repairs to it, under section 19 of the Public Health Acts Amendment Act, 1890, because the houses were not connected with the public sewer in Marquis-road by the single private drain, as was necessary before section 19 could be brought into operation, the initial part of the connection being by sewers.

COZENS-HARDY and FARWELL, L.JJ., concurred.—COUNSEL, *Macmorran, K.C.*, and *Austin F. Jenkin; Danckwerts, K.C.*, and *Randolph Glen*. SOLICITORS, *Croft & Mortimer; Miles & Hair*.

[Reported by F. G. RUCKEN, Barrister-at-Law.]

High Court—Chancery Division.

Re ADAMS, VERRIER v. HASKINS. Kekewich, J. 5th Dec.

ADMINISTRATOR—BEQUEST TO INFANTS CONTINGENTLY—APPLICATION OF INCOME BY ADMINISTRATOR FOR MAINTENANCE OF INFANTS—CONVEYANCING AND LAW OF PROPERTY ACT, 1881 (44 & 45 VICT. C. 41), s. 43.

This adjourned summons came before the court for the determination of the question whether an administrator with the will annexed was justified under the provisions of section 43 of the Conveyancing Act, 1881, in applying for or towards the maintenance, education, or benefit of infants the income of property devised and bequeathed to them contingently upon their attaining the age of twenty-one years. The testatrix by her will, dated the 21st of February, 1893, gave all her real and personal estate to her two children, two of the defendants, but so that one of them, a daughter, should take £800 less than the other, a son. Otherwise her estate was to go to them in equal shares, and if either child should die under twenty-one years of age, the survivor should take the estate; and if both should die under that age leaving lawful issue, the whole of the estate was to go to such issue in equal shares; and if both should die under that age without leaving lawful issue the estate was to go to the statutory next-of-kin of the testatrix. No executor was appointed under the said will. The testatrix died on the 11th of January, 1902, and letters of administration with the will annexed were granted to the plaintiff on the 11th of December, 1903. The daughter was married on the 20th of December, 1904, and has one child, who is also a defendant. Both the children of the testatrix are still infants, and since her death the plaintiff has applied the income derived from the estate to their maintenance. The matter now came before the court for the determination of the question whether the plaintiff should continue to so apply the said income. For the infant children of the testatrix it was urged that where the estate is cleared and the residue ascertained, an executor holds the residue in trust for an infant within the meaning of section 43 of the Conveyancing Act, 1881, and that he is entitled to apply the income thereof for the infant's maintenance, education, or benefit, as provided by the section: *Re Smith, Henderson-Roe v. Hitchens* (38 SOLICITORS' JOURNAL 575, 42 Ch. D. 302). It was further urged that after administration is granted an administrator has equal powers and is in the same position as an executor. Therefore the plaintiff was entitled to continue to apply the income for the benefit of the infant children of the testatrix. For the infant grandchild it was contended that an administrator was not a trustee, but only a mere bailiff: *Re Rose, Jacobs v. Hind* (60 L. T. 596, Kekewich, J., at p. 599), *Re Jones, Christmas v. Jones* (1897, 2 Ch. 190, Kekewich, J., at p. 208).

KEKEWICH, J., in giving judgment, said that anyone holding property that belongs to an infant holds it as a "trustee" within the meaning of section 43 of the Act of 1881. This was not affected by the fact that for the purposes of other Acts the word "trustee" has other meanings. The administrator was therefore entitled to continue to apply the income as he had done heretofore.—COUNSEL, *Whinney; Baden Fuller; Harman*. SOLICITORS, *Gribble, Odde, Sinclair, & Johnson*.

[Reported by P. JOHN BOLAND, Barrister-at-Law.]

Re PIERCY (DECEASED). WHITHEAM v. PIERCY. Neville, J. 5th and 6th Dec.

TENANT FOR LIFE AND REMAINDERMAN—COMPANY—COMPANIES ACT, 1880, ss. 3, 4, 5—REPAYMENT OF CAPITAL BY COMPANY OUT OF PROFITS—CAPITAL OR INCOME.

Adjourned summons. This case raised a question between the tenants for life and remaindermen interested under the will of Benjamin Piercy as to who was entitled to receive the sum of £310 4s. 2d., which had come to the hands of the trustees as a return of part of the capital of certain fully-paid shares in the Shone Drainage, Sewerage, and Water Supply Co. (Limited and Reduced). It also involved a question as to the construction of sections 3, 4, and 5 of the Companies Act, 1880. Part of the outstanding personal estate of the testator Benjamin Piercy consisted of fifty shares of £10 each fully paid up in the above-mentioned company. It was found impossible to sell the shares and accordingly an order was granted by the court in 1892 giving the trustees leave to retain them. No dividends had ever been paid on the shares, but all the profits of the com-

pany were applied to the reduction of capital, in view of the fact that certain patents belonging to the company and forming their chief assets were gradually running out. The present summons asked (*inter alia*) that the trustees of the testator's estate might be at liberty to appropriate to income the sums received year by year from the said company in repayment of the said shares.

NEVILLE, J., after referring to the above facts, continued: With regard to the earlier of these payments made by the company they were made without the passing of any special resolution. The payment was accompanied by memoranda, one of which he had before him. It was dated the 29th of February, 1904, and was addressed to one of the shareholders and signed by the secretary of the company, and ran: "Dear Sir,—I enclose cheque, value 'so-and-so,' being in payment of fifteen shillings and three-pence per share on account and in reduction of share capital held by you in this company in accordance with the resolution passed at the annual meeting of the company and held on the 25th inst.," &c. On the 6th of September, 1905, a special resolution was passed in accordance with the provisions of the Companies Act, 1880, s. 3. On the first part of that resolution, providing for the return of 7s. 6d. per share out of the accumulated and undivided profits, no question arose. The second part of the resolution was as follows: "That like returns heretofore made to each holder of 'A' or 'preferred' shares in the company, amounting altogether to £3 14s. 1d. per share, be, and the same are, hereby confirmed." And the third part ran: "That the directors be and they are hereby authorized at any time, and from time to time hereafter, out of accumulated undivided profits of the company to return to each holder of 'A' or 'preferred' shares in the company such sum or sums as the directors may think fit in further reduction of the paid-up capital of the company, and to the intent that the unpaid capital of the company may be increased by a like amount." With regard to parts 2 and 3 of the resolution, their validity had to be determined, inasmuch as they attempted to confirm returns made in the past and to authorize returns to be made in the future. It all depended on the construction of sections 3, 4, and 5 of the Companies Act, 1880. That section 3 was not intended to enable a special resolution to be passed with prospective operation was shown by the initial words of the section: "When any company has accumulated," and was emphasized by the provision in section 5 giving any shareholder a right to require the company to "retain" within one month after the passing of the special resolution. That a retrospective effect was not intended was indicated by the reference to an "accumulated sum of undivided profits," and also by the fact that the shareholders who passed the resolution would not necessarily be the same as those to whom the return had been made. In his opinion, therefore, parts 2 and 3 of the special resolution were invalid. Then the question arose as to whether the tenants for life of the estate were entitled to receive the amounts returned with which those two parts of the resolution purported to deal. He thought they were; the true rule to be inferred from the cases as between tenant for life and remainderman seemed to be that the tenant for life was entitled to all payments out of profits made by a company, unless such profits had been validly capitalized by the company: *Bouch v. Sproule* (36 W. R. 193, 12 A. C. 385) and *Re Hopkins' Trusts* (22 W. R. 687, 18 Eq. 696). It being also clear that the testator's will gave the tenants for life the income of the testator's investments retained by the trustees, he would make the declaration asked for by the summons and order the sum therein mentioned to be treated as income of the estate.—COUNSEL, *F. Thompson; J. Henderson; J. L. Stirling; G. Lawrence*. SOLICITORS, *Feld, Roscoe, & Co.; Crowders, Vizard, Oldham, & Co.; Solicitor to the Treasury*.

[Reported by R. E. V. BAX, Barrister-at-Law.]

HENRY LEETHAM & SONS (LIM.) AND OTHERS v. JOHNSTONE-WHITE. Neville, J. 7th Dec.

RESTRAINT OF TRADE—COVENANT—PRINCIPAL AND SUBSIDIARY COMPANIES—REASONABLENESS—AREA.

Motion. This was a motion for an injunction to restrain the defendant, in breach of an agreement, from entering or continuing in the service of a rival firm, and from entering the service of any wheat or corn miller or grain or flour miller within the area of Great Britain and Ireland. Sydney Leetham, the chairman of Henry Leetham & Sons (Limited), acting as agent for the company and also for five other companies carrying on similar trades as corn, wheat or flour millers, in each of which he was a director, on the 18th of September, 1905, entered into an agreement on behalf of all the said companies with the defendant. In this agreement the named plaintiff company was called the principal company, and the other five plaintiff companies were called the subsidiary companies. By this agreement the said Sydney Leetham, therein called "the master," engaged the defendant, therein called "the servant," to serve the principal company or one of the subsidiary companies in such capacity or sphere as the master should from time to time appoint, and the servant agreed to serve the principal company or one of the subsidiary companies in such capacities at a salary of £208 per annum. The contract was terminable at one month's notice on either side. Clause 4 was as follows: "The servant hereby agrees with the master that he will not within the area of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland enter the service of any other wheat or corn miller, or grain or flour factor, or flour-milling engineer, or either directly or indirectly engage in selling or dealing in flour offals, or any other articles or goods dealt in or manufactured by the principal and subsidiary companies within five years from the expiration of his engagement with either the principal, or any, or either, of the subsidiary companies without the consent in writing of the principal company." Clause 7 provided that all restrictions and conditions contained in the agreement expressed to be made with the master should have effect and be

construed as if they were made in separate agreements entered into by the servant with the principal company and each of the subsidiary companies, and might be put in force by any one of those companies in whose actual service the servant had been at any time during the continuance of the agreement. In December, 1905, one of the subsidiary companies, for whom the defendant was then travelling in Northumberland, Durham, and Yorkshire, by due notice determined his employment. In September, 1906, the plaintiffs discovered that the defendant had entered into the employment of Marshalls (Limited), of the Victoria and Haven Roller Flour Mills, at Grimsby. The plaintiffs thereupon brought the present proceedings. It was agreed to treat the motion as the trial of the action.

NVILLE, J., said that, on the construction of the agreement, he was bound to come to the conclusion that the restrictions imposed on the defendant were not contrary to the law as it now stood. It was clear that the business of the plaintiff companies was very extensive and that the United Kingdom did come within the area of their trading. Therefore clause 4 of the agreement could not be said to be unreasonable as being too wide for the protection of their trade. That being so it was not arbitrary and in restraint of trade. He must consequently, though reluctantly, grant the injunction with costs.—COUNSEL, *Bramcwell Davis, K.C.*, and *J. M. Gover*; *Jenkins, K.C.*, and *F. M. Preston*. SOLICITORS, *Griffith & Gardiner*, for *R. Neubald Kay*, York; *North, Kirk, & Co.*, Liverpool.

[Reported by R. E. V. BAX, Barrister-at-Law.]

High Court—King's Bench Division.

REX v. JUSTICES OF CARMARTHENSHIRE. *Ex parte WILLIAM JOHN.* Div. Court. 11th Dec.

JUSTICES—SUMMONS—PERSONAL COMPLAINT LAID AGAINST DEFENDANT BY COMPLAINANT—JUSTICES ON EVIDENCE BIND OVER COMPLAINANT AS WELL AS DEFENDANT—APPLICATION BY COMPLAINANT FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI ON THE GROUND THAT ORDER AGAINST HIM WAS MADE WITHOUT JURISDICTION.

Counsel moved *ex parte* for a writ of *certiorari* to bring up for the purpose of being quashed an order of the Llanelly justices directing the applicant for the writ, William John, a rate collector, to enter into recognizances and be of good behaviour. John had lodged a personal complaint before the justices against Evan Williams alleging that he went in bodily fear of him, and the justices made an order binding over Williams to be of good behaviour, and they also made a similar order against the complainant. The order against the complainant set forth that he had unlawfully used threats towards defendant which were calculated to provoke a breach of the peace, but omitted the essential words, that the defendant went in bodily fear. It was contended that this order was made by the justices without jurisdiction as no formal charge had been preferred against him. If a summons had been taken out by the defendant against the complainant the latter could have called evidence to rebut it. Moreover, the order objected to omitted, it was suggested purposely, words to the effect that William John, who was ordered thereby to find recognizances, had caused the defendant to go in bodily fear. There was a *dictum* of Lord Coleridge in *Phillips v. Justices of Gateshead* (L. T. July 19, 1879), and referred to in *Haslach v. Shaw* (the *Times* of Dec. 8, 1882), both noted in Stone, that bodily fear must be averred by the complainant to support a prosecution.

DARLING, J., said if they had not been bound he did not think that the court would have felt inclined to grant a rule. The magistrates had heard the case and made the order against the complainant. But some preliminaries about taking out a summons had not been fulfilled, and on that ground the complainant was entitled to a rule *nisi* for a writ of *certiorari*.

BUCKNELL, J., concurred. Order accordingly.—COUNSEL, *E. Grimwood Meers*. SOLICITORS, *Speckly, Mumford, & Craig*, for *J. Lewis Phillips*, Llanelly.

[Reported by ESKINE REID, Barrister-at-Law.]

COOPER (SURVEYOR OF TAXES) v. REV. D. Y. BARKISTON. Bray, J. 11th Dec.

REVENUE—INCOME TAX—INCUMBENT OF BENEFICE—EASTER OFFERINGS—INCOME TAX ACTS, 1842 (5 & 6 VICT. C. 35), s. 2, SCHEDULE E; AND 1853 (16 & 17 VICT. C. 34), s. 146, SCHEDULE E, RR. 1, 4.

This was a special case stated by the Commissioners of Inland Revenue at the instance of the Crown for the purpose of having the question decided whether clergymen were liable to be assessed to income tax under Schedule E in respect of the voluntary gifts made to them, and popularly known as Easter offerings. The surveyor of taxes had assessed to income tax £56 received by the Rev. D. Y. Barkiston, vicar of East Grinstead, as an Easter offering. The amount was the result of a collection in church, supplemented by subscriptions from members of the church not present, and Nonconformists with whom the vicar was said to be popular. It was intended that the gift should be a freewill offering for the vicar's private use. On behalf of the surveyor of taxes reliance was placed on the fact that a clergyman need not apply for this gift, if his income was adequate to his requirements, but if he did so it was by way of increase of income. These Easter offerings were given only to clergymen, and therefore were profits accruing by virtue of their office.

BRAY, J., in giving judgment, said the Crown had failed to satisfy him

that the money which the respondent had received had accrued to him by reason of his office. There had been several cases upon this point and he had first to decide the principle laid down by those authorities. *Herbert v. McQuade* (1902, 2 K. B. 631) decided that a grant to a clergyman from the Queen Victoria Clergy Sustentation Fund was a "perquisite or profit accruing by reason of his office." In that case, Collins, M.R., said: "If, as the respondent contended, it was in fact a gift personal to himself, I do not think it was a gift within Schedule E; if, on the other hand, it accrued to him by virtue of his office of incumbent, the respondent himself could hardly dispute his liability." Discussing the nature of the payments in that case, Collins, M.R., said: "Are they designed to be gifts to persons who happen to be poor whilst they are in occupation of benefices which are also poor, or are they primary intended to augment the allotted stipends attached to particular benefices without special personal reference to the incumbent for the time being." The same principle as to the true test of liability was laid down by Collins, M.R., in *Poynting v. Faulkner* (21 Times L. R. 428). The learned judge then referred to the facts set out in the special case and to the bishop's letter printed in the parish magazine, in which the passage occurred, "it becomes both the duty and the privilege of the laity to do what they can to rectify or mitigate hardships [of the clergy who possess little or no private means] by freewill personal gifts." The words were "to mitigate hardships," not "to increase incomes." *Turton v. Cooper* (22 Q. B. D. 150) shewed that the fact of collection in church did not affect the case. He came to the conclusion that there was nothing to justify him in holding that these moneys were assessable, and the appeal of the Crown must therefore be dismissed with costs. Judgment for the defendant.—COUNSEL, *Sir W. S. Robson, S.G.*, and *W. Finlay*; *Dankwerts, K.C.*, and *Austen-Cartmell*. SOLICITORS, *The Solicitor to Inland Revenue*; *Hare & Co.*

[Reported by ESKINE REID, Barrister-at-Law.]

Solicitors' Cases.

Re W. S. JEROME, A SOLICITOR. Kekewich, J. 5th Dec.

COSTS—TAXATION—SOLICITOR AND SOLICITOR-MORTGAGEE—AGREEMENT TO SHARE COSTS—MORTGAGOR NOT AFFECTED BY—MORTGAGEES' LEGAL COSTS ACT, 1895 (58 & 59 VIC. C. 25, s. 2).

This was a summons to review taxation of a solicitor's costs. It appeared that the applicant, a widow, was entitled in reversion on the death of a lady aged seventy years to one half of £7,084 India 3½ per cent. Stock. On the 13th of December, 1905, the applicant approached the respondent, a solicitor, for the purpose of getting him to negotiate for her an advance of £250 by way of mortgage on her reversionary interest. On the 15th of December, 1905, the respondent wrote a letter to another solicitor, a former partner of the respondent's (hereinafter called the mortgagee) asking him if he would advance the sum of £250 to the applicant. The letter went on "As to costs, this has not yet been fixed, and as the title is very simple and clear I do not think I shall get more than twelve guineas, and disbursements, and I am quite willing you should have one half of the costs—namely, six guineas." In answer to this the mortgagee called on the respondent and intimated to him his willingness to lend the money, and the respondent was to act for him as his solicitor in the matter. The mortgage was completed on the 22nd of December, 1905, the respondent retaining the sum of £23 17s. 10d. for his costs out of the £250. This deduction for costs was shewn by a statement of accounts which was signed by the applicant's then solicitors, the applicant also being present at the time. On the 19th of January, 1906, the applicant's present solicitors wrote to the respondent asking for a detailed bill of costs. In replying to this application the respondent, on the 29th of January, 1906, supplied a bill of costs amounting to £29 19s. 4d., leaving £6 1s. 6d. due after deducting the £23 17s. 10d. On the 22nd of March, 1906, during the taxation of the said bill of costs, the applicant's solicitors obtained possession of the letter of the 15th of December, 1905, from the respondent to the mortgagee. This was the first intimation the applicant or her solicitors had had of the existence of such a letter or arrangement between the respondent and the mortgagee. Accordingly the applicant made further objections to the taxation of the respondent's bill of costs on the ground that, having regard to the arrangement contained in the said letter of the 15th of December, 1905, she was not liable to pay more than one half of the taxed costs of the respondent, or in the alternative that the amount of the bill should be reduced by the sum of £6 1s., or whatever sum the respondent paid or became liable to pay to the mortgagee in pursuance of the arrangement contained in the said letter. The master, in his answer, disallowed this objection on the ground that the mortgagee was a solicitor to whom a mortgage was made, and that the letter of the 15th of December, 1905, made the respondent and the mortgagee a firm within the meaning of section 2 of the Mortgagees' Legal Costs Act, 1895, and the division of the profits of a transaction between the members of a firm of solicitors one of whom is the mortgagee does not, since the Act of 1895, affect the mortgagor. Thereupon the applicant issued this summons asking that the further objections might be allowed. For the applicant it was urged that the letter of the 15th of December, 1905, did not constitute the respondent and the mortgagee a firm. A partnership could be created for the carrying out of one transaction, but a firm could not. It was further urged that the object of the Act of 1895 was to enable a solicitor-mortgagee to charge costs. It did not apply to this case. Here the respondent was the solicitor and the mortgagee was simply a mortgagee. The mortgagor did not employ the mortgagee. For the respondent it was contended that the Act of 1895 had nothing to do with this case. It really turned on the interpretation of the

letter of the 15th of December, 1905, and that was simply a conditional promise by the respondent to hand over part of his costs to the mortgagee.

KKEWICH, J., in giving judgment, said that this is what is called a third party taxation. The mortgagee, who happened to be a solicitor, agreed to advance a certain sum of money to the applicant, and in order to carry through the transaction he employed the respondent as his solicitor. It so happened that the respondent had been employed by the applicant to find a lender, and, to some extent at any rate, he was also her solicitor. On the completion of the transaction a sum was deducted for costs. The applicant was not content with that, and required the delivery of a bill, which she was entitled to have. That bill was delivered and is now being taxed. That bill, as between the respondent and the mortgagee, has been settled, or at any rate there is no contest between them; but the applicant is entitled to have it taxed as the party liable to pay. The mortgagee is entitled to be indemnified against all costs, and if the transaction had not yet been completed the ordinary course would have been to deduct them from the amount of the advance, as it is admitted that of course he is entitled to have those costs paid to him hereafter, but the applicant is entitled to say that she would only pay the proper costs; that it is an indemnity against proper costs. The mortgagee is entitled to an indemnity against all proper costs incurred to his solicitor, and though nominally the applicant is taxing the solicitor's costs, she really is ascertaining whether the mortgagee has paid what are the proper costs. They have been taxed with the costs of taxation at a certain amount, and the applicant says that six guineas must be deducted from that amount, not because the respondent has already been paid that sum but because he has paid it over to the mortgagee. There is nothing wrong in that. He has agreed to give up six guineas of his costs to somebody. It so happens that that somebody is a solicitor and also the lender, and he has agreed to do it, it must be supposed, for some consideration which does not appear, but he has agreed to do it. The mortgagee is liable to pay the respondent the full bill of costs, and he is none the less liable because six guineas will come into his hands out of that bill when taxed. The mortgagee's agreement with the respondent is to pay the whole of the bill, the respondent giving him six guineas out of it. It is impossible to follow what the master says about the mortgagee and the respondent being a firm. On this third party taxation all that the applicant is entitled to do is to tax the bill, find out what the respondent's costs were against the mortgagee, and find out if that is affected by the agreement that out of the total costs the respondent was to pay the mortgagee six guineas. The application must be dismissed with costs.—COUNSEL, *Jessel, K.C.*, and *Martelli*; *P. O. Lawrence, K.C.*, and *Rowlands*. SOLICITORS, *Grover, Humphreys, & Co.*; *W. S. Jerome*.

[Reported by P. JOHN BOLAND, Barrister-at-Law.]

Societies.

Incorporated Law Society of Liverpool.

The following are extracts from the report of the committee:

Members.—The society now consists of 409 members. The number of barristers and others, not being members, who subscribe to the library is sixty-five. During the past year five new members have been elected—viz., Messrs. W. H. T. Brown, E. W. Bullen, C. H. Hilton, W. H. Reinhardt and J. Roberts. During the same period five members, in addition to the deceased members, have ceased to belong to the society.

Legal Education.—During last session 614 lectures and classes were delivered and held under the auspices of the Liverpool Board of Legal Studies and the Faculty of Law of Liverpool University. In addition to the subjects prescribed for the law degree at the university, a complete course of study was provided for articled clerks reading for the Intermediate and Final Examinations of the Law Society, including elementary and advanced courses of lectures and classes on conveyancing, real property, personal property, contracts, torts, bailments, companies, evidence and procedure, admiralty, equity, trusts, administration and mortgages, and Stephen's Commentaries. The number of class entries for the whole of the session was 623, as against 508 in the previous year, and 389 in 1903-4. The board have during the present session issued a syllabus of special lectures providing a course of study of law for articled clerks who have passed the Intermediate Examination but who are not taking a law degree at the university. The board desire to induce every articled clerk in Liverpool as soon as he has passed his Intermediate Examination to enter upon the complete and connected course of study prescribed by and indicated in such syllabus, which is arranged to extend over a period of two years, during which the whole of the subjects for the Final Examination of the Law Society will be dealt with by competent and experienced teachers. It too often happens that an articled clerk leaves any serious study for his Final Examination until late in his term of articles, and the committee hope that the course which has been arranged will be taken advantage of to the utmost, as the systematic study of the theory and practice of the law so necessary for thorough knowledge cannot be compensated for by work, however arduous, compressed into a few months. The Council of the Law Society last year increased their grant to the Liverpool Board of Legal Studies from £250 to £350. The thanks of the profession in Liverpool are due to the Council for the practical support which they have given. The Board of Legal Studies has now been incorporated under section 23 of the Companies Act, 1867.

Fees for Affidavits.—The attention of the committee has been called to the practice of commissioners for oaths charging only 1s. for swearing county court affidavits. The committee desire to point out that the proper

fee is 1s. 6d., and having regard to the decision referred to in the book issued by the Law Society on Practice and Usage in the Solicitors' Profession, p. 81, suspending a commissioner for six months for habitually accepting a fee of 1s., it is important that, in the absence of any authority to the contrary, the proper fee should in all cases be required. In the Court of Passage only 1s. is allowed for swearing an affidavit where the amount claimed in the action is under £50, and when such fee is tendered the commissioner, to protect himself, should inquire whether the action is for an amount which would justify the acceptance of such a fee.

Solicitors and Accountants.—In May last a memorial, signed by representative members of the profession in Liverpool, was addressed to the committee, inquiring whether in their opinion there was any reason why solicitors should not act in the following capacities: Trustees in bankruptcy and receivers; liquidators of companies; trustees under deeds of assignment and for payment of a composition; auctioneers of land. The committee carefully considered the matter and, after communicating with the Law Society, passed a resolution to the effect that they saw no reason why solicitors should not undertake the duties appertaining to any of the above offices. A circular letter to this effect was sent to all the members of the society.

Solicitors' Bills of Costs.—The committee have been requested to give an official expression of opinion as to the desirability of bills of costs rendered by solicitors direct to clients for non-litigious work, except where rendered to trustees, being framed like those in other professions, for services rendered between stated dates at a total figure plus disbursements with a note that details will be furnished if desired. The committee are glad to find that this method of rendering bills of cost is becoming more and more general, and they are of opinion that the practice should be adopted by every solicitor wherever possible, believing, as they do, that it is more acceptable to clients.

Registration of Mortgages on Real and Leasehold Property.—In December last the opinion of the committee was invited by the Liverpool Chamber of Commerce whether it was desirable in the interests of the commercial community that all charges or mortgages given on real and leasehold property should be compulsorily registered, and that the register of such charges and mortgages should be open for inspection at any time by any person on payment of a nominal fee, and further, whether such registration should be enforced irrespective of whether the title to the property charged was or was not itself registered. The committee resolved that it was not desirable in the interests of the commercial community that such a system should be made compulsory, and a copy of the resolution was forwarded to the Chamber of Commerce.

Land Transfer.—On the occasion of the General Election in January last, the committee took the opportunity of communicating with the Parliamentary candidates for Liverpool and district, stating shortly the objections to the principle of compulsory registration of title. Replies were received from several candidates who subsequently became members of Parliament, promising to oppose any movement for the extension of the compulsory provisions of the Land Transfer Act of 1897, without proper inquiry as to the working of the Act in the county of London. The Council of the Law Society have been assured that there is a large number of members of the House of Commons favourable to a reconsideration of the compulsory clauses of the Act of 1897. Two cases decided during the year have proved that registration does not prevent fraud—although it may tend to facilitate it—whilst the supposed protection of the insurance fund is not to be relied upon. The cases referred to are *Marshall v. Robertson* (50 SOLICITORS' JOURNAL, p. 75) and *Attorney-General v. Odell* (22 T. L. R., p. 466). A short note of these cases will be found in Appendix A. In a third case one of the conveyancing counsel to the court has declined to accept an absolute title without investigation: *Re Clark (Deceased)* (54 W. R., p. 385).

County Courts.—The committee regret that no time has been found this Session for the introduction of a Bill which would carry out the improvements sought to be obtained by the Bills which were before Parliament in the Session of 1905. They hope that the Government will introduce a County Court Bill next year, and the Attorney-General has already promised that the matter shall receive the consideration of the Government. In any such Bill a repeal should be included of the reference to section 116 of the Act of 1888 in section 3 of the County Court Act, 1903.

County Court Pounds Fees.—The attention of the committee was called to two points upon which the practice of the county court differs from that of the High Court to the detriment of a judgment creditor—namely, with regard to (1) the fees charged upon issuing execution, and (2) the possession fees payable to the high bailiff where several warrants are levied at the same time against the same person. The committee were of opinion that with a view to bringing the county court practice more into line with that of the High Court a nominal fee only should be charged in cases where no levy is made or the levy is unsuccessful; and further, that where execution is levied upon several warrants and goods are seized to satisfy them all only one fee should be payable to the high bailiff. A representation was therefore made to the County Court Rule Committee, and the secretary to the Lord Chancellor has informed the committee that the matter will be considered at the next meeting.

District Registries.—In the report of last year there is a reference to representations which were made to the Lord Chancellor asking him to take into consideration the desirability of power being accorded to the district registrars of Liverpool and Manchester to exercise wholly or in part the powers of Master in Lunacy in reference to the management and administration of the estates of lunatics within the territorial jurisdiction of the Liverpool and Manchester District Registries respectively, and particularly the taking of accounts of receivers in lunacy of the estates of lunatics within such territorial jurisdiction. The president and

Mr. Arnold Cleaver had an interview with the Lord Chancellor's secretary on the subject in March last, and, at his request, he was supplied with a memorandum shewing how far the powers of the Master in Lunacy could be effectively exercised in the Liverpool and Manchester registries. These powers could only be conferred on the district registrars by an Act of Parliament. The further question of extended powers being granted to the district registrars to deal with the interlocutory proceedings in probate actions was also raised, and a deputation waited upon the President of the Probate Division in order to obtain an expression of his views, and pointed out that effect could be given to this suggestion by an alteration in the rules. The President stated that he knew no reason why the suggestion should not be carried out, and the committee have approached the Lord Chancellor on the subject. It is to be regretted that owing to pressure of work the Lord Chancellor has not been able to deal with these two questions this Session, but the committee will keep them before his lordship in the hope that they may be found next Session to deal with them.

Conveyancing Bills.—Three Bills, prepared on the instructions of the Council of the Law Society, entitled the Conveyancing Bill, Settled Land Bill, and Married Women's Property Bill respectively, have been introduced into Parliament this Session. Whilst the Bills do not involve any new principle as a whole, they are extremely important, as they are designed to settle and set at rest defects and doubts which have been disclosed in the working of the Acts above referred to, and the committee hope they will be soon passed into law. The Bills have passed through all the stages in the House of Lords, and have been read a first time in the House of Commons.

Public Trustee Bill.—This Bill was again introduced into the House of Lords, and was in form almost identical with the Bill of last Session as amended by the Standing Committee on Law. The Lord Chancellor in moving the second reading stated that the object of the Bill was to safeguard estates especially among the poorer classes, by the establishment of a public trustee with special facilities for the administration of small estates. In other trusts the Lord Chancellor stated that the public trustee might be appointed as custodian trustee. The committee believe that a Bill of this nature, even if confined to small estates, is unnecessary. It is also objectionable and mischievous, because it seeks to introduce officialism into a department of life which has hitherto been left to the individual, and would result in making the administration of trusts more expensive, cumbersome, and inflexible. The Select Committee of the House of Commons appointed in 1895 to consider the whole subject, reported against the principle of such a scheme. The committee after carefully considering what action should be taken on the second reading in the House of Commons, came to the conclusion that it would be futile to attempt to obtain the rejection of the Bill, having regard to the fact that it had been starred as a Government measure. They have, therefore, directed their attention to the details of the Bill and have suggested a number of amendments, which they believe will, if carried, improve the Bill and make it more workable. A great difference of opinion exists in the profession as to the desirability of including in this Bill provisions for a compulsory or other audit of trustees' accounts. This question will be raised on the consideration of the Bill in Committee of the House of Commons. Other provisions which will also be discussed, and which have the support of the profession, provide for the cheapening of charging orders, distringas, and stop order procedure. The Council of the Law Society and the Associated Provincial Law Societies are promoting or supporting amendments framed with the object of improving the Bill, and the committee will act in co-operation with both these bodies during the remaining stages of the Bill. The Bill was read a second time in the House of Commons on the 15th of June, and its further consideration adjourned to the autumn sitting.

Solicitors' Benevolent Association.

The usual monthly meeting of the board of directors of this association was held on the 12th inst. at the Law Society's Hall, Chancery-lane, Mr. J. Roger B. Gregory in the chair. The other directors present were Sir George Lewis, Bart., Sir John Hollams, and Messrs. W. C. Blandy (Reading), A. Davenport, Walter Dowson, Charles Goddard, Samuel Harris (Leicester), L. W. North Hickley, W. G. King, C. G. May, R. S. Taylor, Maurice A. Tweedie, and J. T. Scott (secretary). A sum of £800 was distributed in grants of relief, thirteen new members were admitted to the association, and other general business was transacted.

United Law Society.

Dec. 10.—Mr. George C. Peavor in the chair.—Mr. Ralph Wood was elected a member of the society. Mr. Neville Tebbutt moved, and Mr. Ball opposed, the following resolution: "That the case of *Re Nisbet and Pitt's Contract* (1906, 1 Ch. 386) was wrongly decided." The motion was lost by eight votes to two.

The Christmas Vacation paper is not yet issued, but it is stated that Mr. Justice Baggave Deane will be the Christmas Vacation judge from Saturday, the 22nd, to Monday, the 31st inst., inclusive; while Mr. Justice Sutton will be the judge from Tuesday, the 1st of January, to Thursday, the 10th of January, inclusive. There will be no sittings in court during the vacation, but Mr. Justice Baggave Deane will attend at King's Bench Judges' Chambers to hear summonses and urgent applications on Friday, the 28th inst., and Mr. Justice Sutton will sit there on Friday, the 4th of January.

Law Students' Journal.

The Law Society.

HONOURS EXAMINATION.—NOVEMBER, 1906.

At the examination for honours of candidates for admission on the roll of solicitors of the Supreme Court, the Examination Committee recommended the following as being entitled to honorary distinction:

FIRST CLASS.

[In Order of Merit.]

ERNEST FARRINGTON, who served his clerkship with Mr. Robert Scholes, of Manchester.

GILBERT LEONARD ROBEY, who served his clerkship with Mr. Frederick Armitage, of the firm of Messrs. Armitage & Armitage, of London.

CHARLES HAROLD SIMPSON STEPHENSON, LL.B. (Vict.) and LL.B. (Liverpool), who served his clerkship with Mr. Charles Harrison Lockett, of the firm of Messrs. Evans, Lockett, & Co., of Liverpool.

MICHAEL JOHN MCGAHEY, who served his clerkship with Mr. Albert Edward Dunn, M.P., of Exeter and London.

SECOND CLASS.

[In Alphabetical Order.]

Herbert George Bell, M.A. (Camb.), B.A. (Lond.), who served his clerkship with Mr. R. S. Bond, of the firm of Messrs. Rutter, Veitch, & Bond, of London.

Edward Geoffrey Hipsley Cox, who served his clerkship with Mr. Gordon Cox, of the firm of Messrs. Cox & Lafone, of London.

Hugh Vernon Morris Davies, who served his clerkship with Mr. Edward Carleton Holmes, jun., of the firm of Messrs. Carleton Holmes, Son, & Fell; and the Hon. N. M. Sinclair, of the firm of Messrs. Gribble, Oddie, Sinclair, & Johnson, both of London.

William Ebsworth, who served his clerkship with Mr. Robert Winder and Mr. Thomas Hall Winder, both of Bolton.

John Hall, who served his clerkship with Mr. John Henry Fletcher and Mr. Frederick William Bromley, both of Ashton-under-Lyne.

Leonard Stanistreet Holmes, LL.M. (Liverpool), who served his clerkship with Mr. Alexander Allan Miller, of the firm of Messrs. Miller & Son, of Liverpool.

Joseph David Jacobs, who served his clerkship with Mr. Thomas Montague Richards and Mr. Henry Bishop Priest, both of London.

Lionel Clarke Margetts, who served his clerkship with Mr. Alan Clarke Margetts, of Chatteris; and Mr. Frederick Thomas Dubois, of London.

Frank Bertram Mayer, who served his clerkship with the late Mr. F. C. Mayer and Mr. John James Nelson, both of Burslem.

Henry Sigismund Oppe, B.A. (Oxon.), who served his clerkship with Messrs. Hollams, Sons, Coward, & Hawksley, of London.

Anthony Frederick Ingham Pickford, B.A. (Dublin), who served his clerkship with Mr. W. Blews Robotham, of the firm of Messrs. Robotham & Co., of Derby.

Stuart Richardson, LL.B. (Lond.), who served his clerkship with Mr. Hely Owen, of the firm of Messrs. Owen & Bailey, of Huddersfield.

Hugh Edward Roberts, who served his clerkship with Mr. William Robert Evans, of Ruthin and Wrexham; and Messrs. Worthington Evans, Dauney, & Co., of London.

Frederic Charles Squires, who served his clerkship with Mr. Henry Charles Squires, of Cambridge.

Ernest Louis Davis Zeffertt, B.A. (Oxon.), who served his clerkship with Mr. Walter Lumley, of the firm of Messrs. Lumley & Lumley, of London.

THIRD CLASS.

[In Alphabetical Order.]

Leonard Ashley, who served his clerkship with Mr. William Samuel Davis, of Tenbury.

William Bentley, who served his clerkship with Mr. Joseph Arnold Bentley, of the firm of Messrs. Carter, Atkinson, & Bentley, of Pontefract. Edwin Carse, who served his clerkship with Mr. William Webb, of Morpeth.

Oswald Crook Evans, who served his clerkship with Mr. John Lawrence Whitaker, of Haslingden.

Paul Victor Helms, B.A. (Oxon.), who served his clerkship with Mr. Romer Williams, of London.

John Percival Medley, who served his clerkship with Mr. Sydney P. Turnbull, of the firm of Messrs. Turnbull & Son, of Scarborough.

William Richard Pumfrey, who served his clerkship with Messrs. He ry Pumfrey & Co., of London.

Walter John Edwin Clarke, who served his clerkship with Mr. William Wilde, of the firm of Messrs. Burchell, Wilde, & Co., of London.

Philip Randall Elvin Smith, who served his clerkship with Mr. Robert Rogers Nelson and Mr. Joseph John Morgan, both of London.

Robert Emery Taylor, B.A. (Camb.), who served his clerkship with Mr. Arthur Wm. Stileman, of London.

Francis Martin Tomkinson, who served his clerkship with Mr. R. A. Pinsent, of the firm of Messrs. Pinsent & Co., of Birmingham; and Messrs. Field, Roscoe, & Co., of London.

The Council of the Law Society have accordingly given class certificates and awarded the following prizes of books:

To Mr. Farrington—The Clement's-inn Prize—value about £10; and the Daniel Reardon Prize—value about twenty guineas.

To Mr. Robey—The Clifford's-inn Prize—value five guineas; and the John Mackrell Prize—value about £12.
 To Mr. Stephenson—The New-inn Prize—value five guineas.
 To Mr. McGahey—The Law Society's Prize—value five guineas.
 The Council have given class certificates to the candidates in the second and third classes.
 Ninety-nine candidates gave notice for the examination.

Examinations at the Law Society in the Year 1906.

SPECIAL PRIZES OPEN TO ALL CANDIDATES.

SCOTT SCHOLARSHIP.

Harold Moreton Moss being, in the opinion of the Council, the candidate best acquainted with the Theory, Principles, and Practice of Law, they have awarded to him the scholarship founded by Mr. James Scott, of Lincoln's-inn-fields.

Mr. Moss served his clerkship with Mr. Norris Alfred Ernest Way, of the firm of Messrs. Walker, Smith, & Way, of Chester; and Messrs. Chester, Broome, & Griffiths, of London; and obtained the Clement's-inn and the Daniel Reardon Prizes at the Honours Examination held in January, 1906.

BRODERIP PRIZE.

James Victor Lister, being first in order of merit, and having shewn himself best acquainted with the Law of Real Property and the Practice of Conveyancing, passed a satisfactory examination, and attained honorary distinction, the Council have also awarded to him the prize, consisting of a gold medal, founded by Mr. Francis Broderip, of Lincoln's-inn.

Mr. Lister served his articles of clerkship with Mr. Matthew Henry Jones, of the firm of Messrs. Matthew, Jones, & Rees, of Liverpool, and obtained third class Honours at the Honours Examination held in January, 1906.

THE CLABON PRIZE.

Charles Harold Simpson Stephenson, LL.B. Victoria, and LL.B. Liverpool, having shewn himself best acquainted with the Law and Practice of Equity, otherwise passed a satisfactory examination, and attained honorary distinction, the Council have awarded to him the prize founded by Mr. John Moxon Clabon, of Great George-street, Westminster.

Mr. Stephenson served his clerkship with Mr. Charles Harrison Lockett, of the firm of Messrs. Evans, Lockett, & Co., of Liverpool, and obtained the New-inn Prize at the Honours Examination held in November, 1906.

LOCAL PRIZES.

TIMPRON MARTIN PRIZE FOR CANDIDATES FROM LIVERPOOL.

Charles Harold Simpson Stephenson, LL.B. Victoria and LL.B. Liverpool, from among the candidates from Liverpool, who served two-thirds of his period of service there, having passed the best examination, and attained honorary distinction, the Council have awarded to him the gold medal founded by Mr. Timpron Martin, of Liverpool.

Mr. Stephenson served his articles of clerkship as stated above.

ATKINSON PRIZE FOR CANDIDATES FROM LIVERPOOL OR PRESTON.

James Victor Lister, from among the candidates from Liverpool or Preston, having shewn himself best acquainted with the Law of Real Property and the Practice of Conveyancing, otherwise passed a satisfactory examination, and attained honorary distinction, the Council have awarded to him the gold medal founded by Mr. Atkinson, of Liverpool.

Mr. Lister served his articles of clerkship as before mentioned.

BIRMINGHAM LAW SOCIETY'S GOLD MEDAL.

The examiners reported that there was no one qualified to take this prize.

BIRMINGHAM LAW SOCIETY'S BRONZE MEDAL.

The examiners reported that there was no one qualified to take this prize.

STEPHEN HEELIS PRIZE FOR CANDIDATES FROM MANCHESTER OR SALFORD.

Sydney Evershed Agate, from among the candidates from Manchester or Salford, having passed the best examination, and attained honorary distinction, the Council have awarded to him the gold medal founded in memory of the late Mr. Stephen Heelis, of Manchester.

Mr. Agate served his clerkship with Mr. A. H. Worthington, of the firm of Messrs. Darbishire, Tatham, Worthington, & Co., of Manchester; and Messrs. Cunliffe & Davenport, of London; and obtained the Clifford-inn Prize at the Honours Examination held in January, 1906.

THE MELLERSH PRIZE.

Horace Wilfrid Skinner, from among candidates who have been articled in the counties of Surrey or Sussex, or who are the sons of solicitors who have resided or practised in either of those counties, having shewn himself best acquainted with the Law of Real Property and the Practice of Conveyancing, the Council have awarded him the prize founded by the late Mr. Robert Edmund Mellersh, of Godalming.

Mr. Skinner served his clerkship with Mr. Henry Cane, of the firm of Messrs. Colbatch Clark & Cane, of Brighton; and Mr. Henry Ward, of the firm of Messrs. Rooks, Spiers, Wales, & Ward, of London, and obtained third class Honours at the Honours Examination held in March, 1906.

Law Students' Societies.

LAW STUDENTS' DEBATING SOCIETY.—Dec. 4.—Chairman, Mr. P. B. Henderson.—Mr. J. B. Matthews read a paper on "The Married Woman as a Contracting Party." A short discussion followed, at the end of which Mr. Matthews replied to any difficulties that had been raised. A vote of thanks to Mr. Matthews was unanimously carried.

Dec. 11.—Chairman, Mr. Hart.—The subject for debate was: "That the case of *Worthing Corporation v. Heather* (1906, 2 Ch. 532) was wrongly decided." Mr. C. S. Krauss opened in the affirmative, Mr. Cornock seconded in the affirmative; Mr. F. A. J. Morse opened in the negative, Mr. Ames seconded in the negative. The following members continued the debate: Messrs. Pleadwell, Richard, Hill, Dowding, and Adams. The motion was carried by three votes.

Legal News.

Appointments.

MR. JOHN HENRY CLARKE, solicitor, of Bristol, has been appointed Registrar of the District Probate Court at Bristol, in the place of his late brother, Mr. William Hurle Clarke.

MR. DUGDALE, K.C., has been elected Master of the Library of the Honourable Society of the Inner Temple for the ensuing year, in succession to Lord Eversley.

Changes in Partnerships.

Dissolutions.

WALTER RAMSDEN and NORTON CARTER, solicitors (Carter, Ramsden, & Carter), Leeds. Dec. 1. The said Walter Ramsden and his son, Lawrence Hilton Ramsden, will practise as solicitors, under the style or firm of Ramsden & Son, at Commercial-chambers, 102, Albion-street, Leeds; the said Norton Carter will practise as a solicitor alone, under the style of Norton Carter, at Yorkshire Post-buildings, 65, Albion-street, Leeds. [Gazette, Dec. 7.]

REGINALD STORER CHAMBERLAIN, EDWARD WILLIAM JOHNSON, and RICHARD VINCENT JOHNSON, solicitors (Chamberlain & Johnson), Llandudno, Conway, and Llanrwst. Nov. 20. The said Reginald Storer Chamberlain and Edward William Johnson will continue to carry on the business under the same style as heretofore. [Gazette, Dec. 11.]

Information Required.

CATHERINE MAUD HOWELL (deceased).—Anyone who has any knowledge of a Will having been made by Catherine Maud Howell, of Wandsworth, who died, unmarried, on the 21st of November, 1906, or who may have possession of such Will, is requested to kindly communicate at once with Messrs. Kimbers & Boatman, solicitors, 79, Lombard-street, London, E.C.

General.

The Criminal Appeal Bill has been withdrawn.

The judges (Mr. Justice A. T. Lawrance and Mr. Justice Sutton) have fixed the following commission days for the winter sittings on the Northern Circuit: Appleby, Thursday, January 17; Carlisle, Saturday, January 19; Lancaster, Thursday, January 24; Manchester, Tuesday, January 29; Liverpool, Saturday, February 16.

A case came before Bray, J., on Tuesday, for his decision whether or not barristers were bound to affix stamps to their vouchers for fees received. Mr. Pickford, K.C., appearing for the General Council of the Bar, argued that stamps should not be affixed to counsel's vouchers. Counsel had not concluded his arguments when the court adjourned.

A gentleman stopping at a hotel in St. Paul during the recent session of the Bar Association asked a coloured porter with whom he was well acquainted, says the *American Case and Comment*, if the hotel was filled. The reply was, "Yes, sah; filled to the roof." On asking if the guests were lawyers, the porter replied, "Yes, sah, mostly lawyers; those that are not lawyers are judges."

The twentieth meeting of the Bankruptcy Law Amendment Committee was held on the 5th inst. at the Royal Courts of Justice, Mr. Muir Mackenzie (the chairman) presiding. Evidence was given by Mr. Howard Heaton (president of the Birmingham and Midland Society of Chartered Accountants), representing the Birmingham Chamber of Commerce and the Birmingham Millers' Association.

Mr. Justice Bray had before him last week, says the *Times*, forty-one appeals under section 2 (2) of the Licensing Act, 1904, from the Commissioners of Inland Revenue, which had been settled out of court and awaited consent orders. The principles of assessment laid down by Mr. Justice Kennedy in *Ex parte Ashby's Cobham Brewery Co.* and *Ex parte Ashby's Staines Brewery Co.* (22 Times L. R. 725) were adopted as the basis of the settlements, in which were fixed the amount of compensation, and also the amount of costs payable under section 2 (4) to the Inland Revenue authorities out of the compensation money.

A working committee has been formed to found "The Secret Commissions and Bribery Prevention League," in view of the Prevention of Corruption Act, 1906, which comes into force on the 1st of January. The design of the league is that its operations shall be governed by a large council representative of all the principal occupations of the country and of chambers of commerce, trade associations, and the institutes of all professions, and administered by a committee of workable size selected from the council.

Amusing evidence was given, says the *Evening Standard*, at the Yarmouth County Court in what was described as the first "earwig case" (referred to elsewhere). A London gentleman took a house for a month at £10 per week. The house, he said, was infested with swarms of earwigs, which covered the supper table and invaded the beds. The defence was that the earwigs were driven into the house by a violent thunderstorm. Judge Wilmet said the presence of cockroaches, rats, and other pests had been held to be justification for a house being thrown up, but earwigs were only a temporary visitation of nature, like a swarm of wasps or mosquitoes, for which the landlord was not responsible. The jury awarded the owner of the house a month's rent.

In the course of a case before Mr. Justice Neville (reported elsewhere), an application to restrain a breach of a service agreement, the learned judge is stated to have said that he was unable to come to the conclusion that the terms of the agreement were contrary to the law as it stood to-day. He administered this branch of the law with the greatest reluctance. The increasing frequency of actions of this kind shewed the exceeding pressure which was placed on the working commercial population by the state of the law as it now stood. The modern doctrine was, unhappily, that in questions between employer and employee the interests of the employer alone were to be considered, and that no agreement was invalid, however oppressive and fatal it might be to the possibility of the employee earning his livelihood. He was there, however, he concluded, to administer the law as he found it, and must allow the injunction.

The legal profession is, says the *Evening Standard*, particularly well represented in the present House of Commons; yet, if the word be taken of one who practises, the law just now is stagnating. Seeing what a wave of prosperity is now passing over the country, this may sound curious. So, too, sounds the explanation. If a farmer have a bountiful harvest he returns thanks to Providence; if he have a bad season he curses the Government, no matter what its politics. And the lawyer appears to be like the farmer, for he attributes the slackness of legal work to this Parliament—or, rather, to the Labour and Socialistic element in it. Leaders of great enterprises are afraid to launch out, he says, because they do not know what the Labour members may bring about—what new regulations and restrictions, what fresh provisions as to compensation they may get introduced into Bills coming before the House. Probably he is in error, but such is this lawyer's impression.

The President's simplified spelling has, says the *Albany Law Journal*, recently gone up against the Supreme Court of the United States. It happened while the case of Dalcour against the United States was under consideration. Solicitor-General Hoyt was presenting the Government's side and he was reading from a brief which was fairly studded with such words as "dropt" and "fantasy" and "kist." Chief Justice Fuller, with a copy of the brief in hand, followed the reading gravely. He read "thru" and "thruout" and "fantom" and "flit," and not a single expression flitted across his face. Presently the brief arrived at a long quotation from a decision rendered some years ago by Justice Bradley. The simplified word that Mr. Hoyt met in his reading from this was "thru." Hardly was the word out of his mouth before the Chief Justice stopped him. "Is this," said the Chief Justice, in the tone of gentle, suave inquiry, which puts experienced counsel on guard, "supposed to be a quotation from Justice Bradley's official opinion?" Mr. Hoyt looked up, startled. "Yes, sir; in all except the spelling," he blushing replied. "Ah-h-h-h-h!" replied the Chief Justice, with a long rolling inflection, inserting five "h's" in a word that is supposed to have only one. "Hereafter," said Mr. Hoyt, "I will see to it that nothing of this kind occurs. While we follow the President's order in preparing original briefs, I do not feel that we are justified in changing the orthography of judicial opinions, and I will see that it does not happen again."

In the House of Commons, on Monday, Mr. B. S. Straus asked the Chancellor of the Exchequer whether he was aware that, owing to the knowledge of the stock markets that fresh issues of certain home trustee securities were likely to be shortly made, Canadian Three per Cent. Stock stood higher than some trustee stocks guaranteed by the British Government; and whether he would take steps to prevent—anyhow, for some years—any new issues of trustee securities by the Government or municipalities from ranking as trustee investments, and so improve the value of existing trustee stocks and better the credit of the country. The Chancellor of the Exchequer said: "I do not think that, in determining what stocks are to be and are not to be 'trustee' securities, it would be legitimate to have regard to any considerations other than the merits of the stocks themselves. In the cases referred to by my hon. friend, new issues, as a rule, rank *pari passu* with existing issues, and there is, therefore, no ground for such discrimination as is suggested. I have no doubt that the fact that further issues of certain stocks which are guaranteed by the British Government are anticipated has a good deal to do with the present low range of prices of such stocks as compared not only with Canadian Three per Cent., but also as compared with Consols (in regard to which the difference is still more marked); but I cannot think that our credit would be enhanced by an arrangement implying that we no longer regarded our guarantees as of sufficient value to justify a trustee investing in a security which carries it."

A fresh list of appeals to the House of Lords has (says a writer in the *Globe*) been printed. Apart from the *West Riding case*, fourteen appeals now stand for hearing, twelve of which are from England and two from Scotland. Among the cases which will engage the attention of the Law Lords within the next few days are *Daily Express (Lim.) v. Nordheim*, *Dakhyl v. Labouchere*, both of which have stood in the printed list since July. The Judicial Committee, unlike the House of Lords, is wholly free from arrears. Only one of the appeals which stood in its list at the beginning of the present sittings is unheard. It is only in the delivery of its judgments that the committee helps to maintain the ancient reputation of the law for dilatoriness.

A practical joker in the Clerkenwell County Court, on the 6th inst., says the *Daily Mail*, silently and unobserved approached counsel's robing-room while a number of barristers were within waiting for their cases. Quietly he turned the key and disappeared. When the barristers discovered what had happened, Judge Edge, who was summing up a case, was interrupted by loud thumpings on the door. The judge finished his remarks, and was then informed of the reason of the outbursts of indignation in the robing-room. He smilingly remarked: "This is a gross contempt of court. I will adjourn for luncheon." But this did not satisfy the prisoners, for no key could be found to release them. Up till then counsel in the court had been highly amused at the discomfiture of their learned brothers, but they ceased smiling when they realized that their overcoats and hats were in the robing-room. They were hungry for luncheon, but they could not well roam about the streets of Islington in wig and gown. The prisoners were still waiting for liberty when Judge Edge returned, and his Honour, finding it impossible to proceed, sent for a locksmith. The latter was greeted with cheers by the barristers and solicitors in court. After half an hour's work the locksmith found it impossible to open the door from that side, and he found it necessary to gain admission through a window. Then with a few blows the lock was knocked off, and the barristers were liberated after nearly two hours' imprisonment.

In a case before the Recorder, on Monday, says the *Times*, counsel said that at the Bow-street police-court the defendant applied for legal aid under the provisions of the Poor Prisoners' Defence Act, and a solicitor was assigned him, upon whose instructions he was now appearing. Since the committal for trial, the defendant had written to the Treasury informing them that a firm of solicitors in the City had undertaken his defence, and requesting that all his papers might be handed over to that firm. He (the counsel) did not know whether the solicitor assigned to the defendant at Bow-street would be entitled to give up the papers without an order of the court. The defendant said that when he applied for legal aid under the Poor Prisoners' Defence Act he was under the impression that if his application were granted he would be permitted to nominate his own solicitor. He subsequently ascertained that he was not permitted to do so, and that was why he had felt obliged to go to a City firm thoroughly familiar with the kind of matters that had to be investigated. Of course it was necessary for them to have all the papers connected with the defence. What he would like would be to conduct his own defence, but to have a counsel assigned him to advise on the legal points that might arise in the inquiry. The Recorder said he could not make any such arrangement. The fact was that the Poor Prisoners' Defence Act was never intended to apply to complicated financial cases of this sort. He thought that there would be no difficulty about the handing over of the papers, and, as far as possible, the expenses which had been already incurred by the solicitor assigned for the defence at the police court would be allowed. That solicitor had done all that it was his duty to do.

Court Papers.

Supreme Court of Judicature.

Date.	EMERGENCY ROTA.		APPEAL COURT No. 2.		Mr. Justice KERRIDGE.	
	Mr. Justice JONES.		Mr. Justice BUCKLEY.		Mr. Justice GREGG.	
Monday, Dec. 17	Mr. Buxton	Mr. Buxton	Mr. Pemberton	Mr. W. Leach	Mr. W. Leach	Mr. W. Leach
Tuesday 18	Farmer	Beal	Carrington	Greswell	Greswell	Greswell
Wednesday 19	Beal	Borror	Pemberton	W. Leach	W. Leach	W. Leach
Thursday 20	Borror	Beal	Carrington	Greswell	Greswell	Greswell
Friday 21	Carrington	Borror	Pemberton	W. Leach	W. Leach	W. Leach
Saturday 22	Pemberton	Beal	Carrington	Greswell	Greswell	Greswell
Date	Mr. Justice JONES.		Mr. Justice BUCKLEY.		Mr. Justice GREGG.	
	Mr. Justice JONES.		Mr. Justice BUCKLEY.		Mr. Justice GREGG.	
Monday, Dec. 17	Mr. Theod	Mr. Farmer	Mr. King	Mr. Church	Mr. Church	Mr. Church
Tuesday 18	Goldschmidt	Bloxam	King	Church	Church	Church
Wednesday 19	Theod	Farmer	King	Greswell	Greswell	Greswell
Thursday 20	Goldschmidt	Bloxam	King	W. Leach	W. Leach	W. Leach
Friday 21	Theod	Farmer	King	Goldschmidt	Goldschmidt	Goldschmidt
Saturday 22	Goldschmidt	Bloxam	Church	Theod	Theod	Theod

The Christmas Vacation will commence on Monday, the 24th day of December, 1906, and terminate on Saturday, the 8th day of January, 1907, both days inclusive.

Winding-up Notices.

London Gazette.—FRIDAY, DEC. 7.
JOINT STOCK COMPANIES.
LIMITED IN CHANCERY.

BONOPROOF, LIMITED.—Creditors are required, on or before Dec 21, to send in their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to Maurice Jenks, 6, Old Jewry, Liquidator.

BRITISH GUANO AND GENERAL PROSPECTING SYNDICATE, LIMITED.—Creditors are required, on or before Jan 21, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to George Albert Victor Narraway, 35, Queen Victoria st, liquidator.

BRITISH INVE
directed to
Dec 21, at 1
must reach
O J COLLIP
heard Dec
appearing
CARBAYON
before Jan
to Frank B
Horne & F
required, o
their delib
NOVA SCOT
be heard D
must reach
BRIDGES ST
and their
Henry Car
SHIPWRECK
directed to
Notice of D
noon of D
SHARP & F
BRIDGES AD
S. Bennett

MYTTIAN C
their name
George P
NEWCASTLE
required, t
their del
Type, li
FURZAN H
to send t
Benjamin
TAYLOR B
against t
and the p
circus, li
VESTA SY
BARROW P
Parker,

BREWLEY,
LIV
LONAS, C
LOD

SOUTHERN
DU

MACLEAN
Pa
REED, E
E
WREATH
CR

ALDERSON
Su

ALLEN,
BARTON
BARRING

BRAUCH
BROMLE
BROMLE

BUTLER
CHAPMA
COBAN

CRABBE
J
DALMS

DOUGHTY
EDMUND
ETCHING

F
EVERES
GASCON

GOULD
GRAHAM

HARRIS
HOBBS
HUTCH

JACKSON
LEVY

LINCOLN
LITTLE
MILLS

PATON
RATHE
RATHE

BRITISH INVESTMENT ASSURANCE CO., LIMITED—Petn for winding up, presented Dec 5, directed to be heard at the Court House, Government buildings, Victoria st, Liverpool, Dec 21, at 10. **Richardson & Co., Liverpool**, solors for petors. Notice of appearing must reach the above-named not later than 6 o'clock in the afternoon of Dec 20.

J. J. CULLIFORTH & SONS, LIMITED—Petn for winding up, presented Dec 5, directed to be heard Dec 18. **Rooke & Sons, 45, Lincoln's inn fields**, solors for petors. Notice of appearing must reach the above-named not later than 6 o'clock in the afternoon of Dec 17.

CARABYVONSHIRE ELECTRIC TRACTION SYNDICATE, LIMITED—Creditors are required, on or before Jan 7, to send their names and addresses, and particulars of their debts or claims, to Frank Benjamin Fuller, 18, St Helen's pl. **Paines & Co., solors for liquidator**.

EDMUNDS & FRYFES (SHIPPING), LIMITED (IN VOLUNTARY LIQUIDATION)—Creditors are required, on or before Jan 31, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to George Newman Worters, 9, Bow st, liquidator.

NOVA SCOTIA COLLIERIES, LIMITED—Petn for winding up, presented Nov 30, directed to be heard Dec 18. **Bennett & Ferris, Coleman st**, solors for petor. Notice of appearing must reach the above-named not later than 6 o'clock in the afternoon of Dec 17.

BRIDGEN STEAM LAUNDRY CO., LIMITED—Creditors are required, on or before Jan 31, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to George Henry Carter, 1, Queen st, Cheapside, liquidator.

SHIPOWNERS AND MERCHANTS AGENCY, LIMITED—Petn for winding up, presented Dec 5, directed to be heard Dec 18. **Collyer-Bristow & Co., Bedford row**, solors for petor. Notice of appearing must reach the above-named not later than 6 o'clock in the afternoon of Dec 17.

SEAT & PARKER, LIMITED—Creditors are required, on or before Feb 1, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to Walter Gibson Hill, 9, Bennett's hill, Birmingham. **Hooper & Ryland, Birmingham**, solors for liquidator.

London Gazette.—TUESDAY, Dec. 11.
JOINT STOCK COMPANIES.
LIMITED IN CHANCERY.

EGYPTIAN CONTRACT CO., LIMITED—Creditors are required, on or before Jan 18, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to Alexander George Parker, 2, Coleman st, liquidator.

NEWCASTLE AND DISTRICT BILL POSTING AND ADVERTISING CO., LIMITED—Creditors are required, on or before Dec 18, to send their names and addresses, with particulars of their debts or claims, to James John Gillespie, jun, 40, Westgate rd, Newcastle upon Tyne, liquidator.

PURBAE ELECTRIC TRACTION CO., LIMITED—Creditors are required, on or before Jan 8, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to Frank Benjamin Fuller, 18, St Helen's pl. **Paines & Co., solors for liquidator**.

TAYLOR BROTHERS, LIMITED (IN LIQUIDATION)—Creditors and all persons having claims against the company are required, on or before Jan 18, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to White & Leonard, Bank bldg, Ladgate circus, liquidators.

VENTA SYNDICATE, LIMITED—Creditors are required, on or before Jan 18, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to Alexander George Parker, 2, Coleman st, liquidator.

Creditors' Notices.
Under Estates in Chancery.

LAST DAY OF CLAIM.

London Gazette.—TUESDAY, Nov. 27.

BREWLEY, JOHN, Liverpool, Licensed Victualler Dec 27 **Brewley v Vevers**, Registrar, Liverpool Kendall, Liverpool.

LOMAS, GEORGE HENRY, Brooklands, Chester, Bank Manager Dec 21 **Edmison v Lomas**, Registrar, Manchester Dunderdale, Manchester.

London Gazette.—FRIDAY, Nov. 30.

SOUTHERN, CHARLOTTE, Dipton, Durham Dec 24 **Southern v Southern**, Registrar, Durham Aynsley, Consett.

London Gazette.—TUESDAY, Dec. 4.

MACLEAN, JAMES MACKENZIE, Newry sq, Earl's Court Jan 4 **Maclean v Maclean**, Parker, J. Dods, John st, Bedford row.

REED, EDWARD JAMES, White Horse in, South Norwood, Builder Jan 1 **Heffer & Co v Reed**, Watlington, J. Ingle, Broad st House.

WEATHALL, ARTHUR CLEVELY, Buckingham st, Strand, Dairyman Dec 31 **Edwards, Creameries (Lim) v Rimell, Neville, J. March, Church ct, Old Jewry**.

Under 22 & 23 Vict. cap. 35.

LAST DAY OF CLAIM.

London Gazette.—TUESDAY, Dec. 4.

ALDERSON, WILLIAM HENRY, Sunderland, Hosiery Manufacturer Dec 14 **Nesbit, Sunderland**.

ALLEN, WILLIAM JOHN, Sheffield, Wine Merchant Jan 18 **Rodgers & Co, Sheffield**.

BARTING, REV WILLIAM BICKHAM, Bletchley, Bucks Jan 7 **Barting, Chancery** in **BARTINGTON, WILLIAM, Levensham, Lancs** Dec 29 **Scholes, Manchester**.

BRACHAMP, FRANCES BRIDGET, Hunt, Berks Dec 28 **Beauchamp & Gallaher, Worcester**.

BROMLEY, MARTHA JANE, Rosendale, Malvern, Worcester Dec 31 **Bromley, Blomfield st**.

BUTLER, THOMAS EDWARD, Leicester, Druggist Jan 15 **Storoy, Leicester**.

CHAPMAN, STANFORD, Kew, Merchant Jan 11 **Blades & Wing, Delahay st, Westminster**.

COBBAN, EMMA, Waterloo, nr Liverpool Jan 14 **Cornish & Gardner, Liverpool**.

CRANFEE, FLORENCE EDITH CATHERINE, Clarendon rd, Putney Jan 3 **Belfrage & Co, John st, Bedford row**.

DALRYMPLE, MARY ANN, Spilaby, Lincs Dec 17 **Ollard & Co, Wisbech**.

DOUTCHVAITE, MARTHA ANN, Ackworth, Yorks Jan 12 **Carter & Co, Pontefract**.

EDMONDS, MILLS, Mountain Ash, Glam, Ironmonger Jan 19 **C & W Kenshole, Aberdeen**.

ETCHES, CHARLES ANDREWS, Clouddale rd, Balham, House Agent Jan 4 **Bat & Co, Bedford row**.

EVERIS, JAMES, West Bromwich, Staffs Dec 31 **Caddick & Son, West Bromwich**.

GARSON, GEORGE, Cowden, Kent, Labourer Jan 1 **Turner, East Grinstead**.

GOULDING, NOAH, Hillsborough, Sheffield Feb 1 **Richardson, Sheffield**.

GRAINGER, CECILIA ROBERTA MARGARET, Matheson rd, Kensington West Jan 7 **Sanlers, King William st**.

HARRIS, SAMUEL JAMES, Halton Park, Lanes Jan 1 **Paisce & Cross, Clement's inn**.

HOBKINS, ELIZA, Harrogate Dec 15 **Dawson & Wood, Harrogate**.

HUTCHINS, ISABELLA, Redland, Bristol Jan 15 **Tapsell, Bristol**.

JACKSON, CHARLES WILLIAM, Congleton, Chester, Licensed Victualler Dec 13 **H L & W P Reed, Congleton**.

LEVETT, THOMAS CHARLES, Kennington grove, Upper Kennington in Dec 24 **Haslip, Martin's in**.

LINCOLN, JOHN CLARKE, Thundersley, Essex, Farmer Dec 31 **Woodard & Co, Southend on Sea**.

LITTLE, MARGARET, Worcester Dec 31 **March, Worcester**.

MILLS, JOSEPH, Sheffield, Licensed Victualler Jan 11 **Webster & Styring, Sheffield**.

PATMORE, CONVENTRY PROCTOR MILNER, Beltinge, nr Herne Bay, Master Mariner Jan 3 **Oldfield & Co, Walbrook**.

RATK, BOY JOHN, East Twickenham Dec 31 **Clements & Co, Old Broad st**.

RATBORNE, THOMAS, Hrotham Dec 31 **Cotching, Hrotham**.

RATLIFFE, BERNARD EDWARD, Lime grove, Shepherd's Bush Jan 31 **Pears & Co, Albemarle st**.

REYNOLDS, ELIZABETH, Derby Jan 30 **J & W H Sale & Son, Derby**.

SCOVILL, ALEXANDER, Shirley, Southampton Jan 15 **Paris & Co, Southampton**.

SHARP, FREDERICK, Parkstone, Dorset, Pottery Manufacturer Dec 31 **Blackcroft & Co, Theobalds rd**.

SIDNEY, JOHN, Erlanger rd, New Cross Jan 4 **Lowes, Erlanger rd, New Cross**.

SMITH, ARTHUR, Gillingham, Farmer Jan 18 **Prall & Co, Rochester**.

SMITH, JOHN, Kingsbury, Warwick, Grocer Dec 30 **Jaques & Sons, Birmingham**.

SODEN, JAMES, Southwold, Suffolk Jan 1 **Cooper, Southwold**.

SPILLER, WILLIAM HUTCHINSON, Royal Exchange bldg, Insurance Manager Dec 31 **Dommett & Son, Gresham st**.

STUCKEY, MART, Bournemouth Jan 14 **Pool, South Petherton, Somerset**.

TAYLOR, HENRY, Kingston on Thames Jan 1 **Sherrard & Son, Kingston on Thames**.

TAYLOR, RICHARD, Headingly, Leeds Jan 1 **Dawson & Chapman, Leeds**.

WADE, MARGARET, Hovingham, Norfolk Jan 1 **Goodchild, Norwich**.

WESTLAKE, AGNES, Fordingbridge, Hants Jan 31 **Howe & Rake, Channery in**.

WOODHEAD, TIMOTHY, Swinton, Lancs, Calico Printer Jan 1 **Swire & Higson, Manchester**.

London Gazette.—FRIDAY, Dec. 7.

ALGER, JAMES, Dies, Norfolk Jan 5 **Lyles & Sons, Dies**.

BROOKE, MARGARET CHABON, Hattow Dec 29 **Laurence & Co, Manchester**.

BAILLY, ROBERT DUDLEY STUART, Fortunes Well, Dorset, Master Mariner Jan 7 **Greenip & Co, George st, Marlborough House**.

BAXTER, ARTHUR, Sheffield, Licensed Victualler Jan 19 **Dransom & Son, Sheffield**.

BROWN, WILLIAM HENRY, JR, Alveston, Glos Dec 21 **Crosmann & Co, Thornbury, RSO, Glos**.

BURNS, RICHARD, Moss Side, Manchester Jan 14 **Lawson & Co, Manchester**.

CAPPER, JOE, Almondsbury, nr Huddersfield, Builder Jan 13 **Sykes, Huddersfield**.

COBE, SARAH, Bournemouth Feb 1 **Hughes & Sons, John st, Bedford row**.

CORREN, LUCY, Tunbridge Wells Dec 31 **Dawes & Sons, Angel of, Thorngorton st**.

COLLINGS, JAMES, Haic Carr, Bowdon, Chester Jan 16 **Wrigley & Co, Oldham**.

CURTIS, JOHN, Rhymsney, Mon Jan 1 **Trump, Rhymsney, Mon**.

DE VITRE, HENRY DANIEL, Wantage, Berks Dec 31 **Holt & Co, Lincoln's inn fields**.

DON, ARTHUR GORRUTT, Stockport, Surgeon Jan 31 **Johnston, Stockport**.

DOVER, ROSA, Royal Leamington Spa, Warwick Jan 1 **Paseman, Leamington**.

EARNshaw, JOHN, Birkby, Huddersfield, Confectioner Jan 13 **Sykes, Huddersfield**.

EMMA, LUCY, New Southgate Jan 1 **Miller & Co, Telegraph st**.

EMINGTON, JOSEPH THOMPSON, Scarborough Jan 4 **Hick & Son, Scarborough**.

EVANS, MARY ELIZABETH, Northfleet, Kent Jan 5 **A'Barrow, Lincoln's inn fields**.

FOWLER, SYDNEY, Halk gds, Brixton, Surveyor Dec 31 **Witty, Old Jewry chambers**.

GARD, SRI GOWDA CHANDRA GAJASTI KARAYADA DEVU, Rajah of Parakimedi, Parakimedi, Madras, India Jan 5 **Maddison & Co, Old Jewry**.

GRAFFITH, REV GRIFFITH WILLIAM, Gwestwen, Anglesey Jan 12 **Jones, Bangor**.

HARRISON, WILLIAM AKERS, Malahide, Dublin Jan 15 **Atkinson & Dresser, Finbury sq**.

HARTLEY, JOSEPH, Manchester, File Manufacturer Jan 10 **Buttton & Co, Manchester**.

HILDICE, FRANK SPENCER, Cheltenham, Publican Jan 8 **Lamb, Cheltenham**.

HILL, JAMES, Keelby, Lincs, Rope Merchant Jan 15 **Wilkin & Chapman, Grimsby**.

JAGGERS, SARAH, Grimsby Jan 18 **Wilkin & Chapman, Grimsby**.

JERSON, WILLIAM, Balham Park rd, Contractor Dec 31 **Butcher, Bouverie st, Fleet st**.

JOLLY, SAMUEL ALD, Acton Jan 5 **Bedfern & Hunt, Abchurch la**.

KLUKERT, JOHAN DAVID, Emmott st, Mile End Dec 27 **Madams & Co, Leadenhall st**.

LEACH, WALTER, Martock, Somerset Dec 31 **Newman & Co, Yeovil**.

LINDSELL, FRANCES MAUDE, Cardington Green, Beds Jan 10 **Halliley & Morris, Bedford**.

MCALPIN, MARY ANN, Sterahold av, Streatham hill Dec 31 **Jennings & Co, Leadenhall st**.

MASTERS, JAMES, Osmaston, Derby Jan 18 **Richardson, Burton on Trent**.

MILLER, RICHARD, Arley, Warwick Dec 23 **Hakeway, Nuneaton**.

MITCHELL, JULIA, Sydney, N & Wales Jan 19 **Hend, London Wall**.

MOULD, MARGARET, Bolton le Sands, Lancs Jan 15 **Threlfall, Southport**.

ORR, JOHN, Cartmel, Lancs, Joiner Jan 10 **Jackson & Sons, Ulverston**.

ORR, THOMAS, Cartmel, Lancs, Yeoman Jan 31 **Jackson & Sons, Ulverston**.

PENNEBOE AND MONTGOMERY, BT Hon GENTLEDE FRANCES, Countess of Jan 20 **Stow & Co, Lincoln's inn fields**.

POPPE, HANNAH, Wedmore, Somerset Jan 10 **Smith & Co, Wedmore, Somerset**.

PROVIE, ELIZABETH DANCASTER, Princes sq, Bayswater Jan 31 **Giddins, Sherborne in**.

REED, CHARLES, St Kilda's rd, Stoke Newington, Commercial Clerk Jan 19 **East, Basinghall st**.

ROUND, CHARLES, Earley Rise, Reading Jan 8 **Martin & Martin, Reading**.

ROUTH, REV JOHN WILLIAM, Tilshurst Rectory, nr Reading Jan 4 **Routh & Co, Southampton st, Bloomsbury**.

ST JOHN, CAROLINE, Finchampstead, Berks Jan 10 **Meredith & Co, New sq, Lincoln's inn**.

SAMUEL, SAMUEL, Guildford st, York rd, Lambeth, Contractor Jan 12 **Barnard, Westminster Bridge rd**.

SIMMONS, HENRY ALFRED, Manchester, Wine Merchant Dec 31 **Norton & Howe, Tottenham**.

TAPPER, JOHN, Edgware rd, Licensed Victualler Jan 12 **Chatterton, Blomfield st**.

THOMPSON, THOMAS, Winstan, Durham, Bank Agent Jan 15 **Dees & Thompson, Newcastle upon Tyne**.

VINT, SAMUEL, Idle, Bradford Jan 28 **Weatherhead & Knowles, Bradford**.

WALKER, EDWARD JOSHUA, Dresden Jan 7 **Fyke & Parrott, Lincoln's inn fields**.

WATLEY, EMANUEL, Dudley, Worcester Dec 29 **Hooper & Fairbairn, Dudley**.

London Gazette.—TUESDAY, Dec. 11.

ATKINS, GEORGE JONES, Amburst pk, Stamford hill, Inventor Jan 22 **Mann & Crimp, Essex st, Strand**.

BLAKE, JOSEPH HAMMOND, Claybury, Essex Jan 8 **S one & Co, Bath**.

BROWN, MARY, Palace rd, Tulse Hill Jan 1 **Bartfield & Child, Plowden bldg, Temple**.

COBURN, CLARA, Leytonstone, Essex Dec 31 **Holdsworth & Payne, Sergeant's inn, Temple**.

CORVAY, MARIK THERESA, Westbourne ter, Paddington Feb 6 **Woolmer, Temple chambers**.

COWELL, CHARLES HENRY, Ipswich Jan 21 **Notcutt & Son, Ipswich**.

GOODE, JONATHAN NEWTON, Awtie, nr Newham on Severn Jan 13 **Watson, Bristol**.

HARKER, SARAH, Yeodon, Yorks Jan 8 **Carter, Leeds**.

HENWITT, MARY, Sowerby Bridge, Yorks Jan 1 **Hoyle, Sowerby Bridge**.

HICKS, GEORGE AUGUSTUS, Bournemouth East Jan 31 **Stotham & Sons, Fenchurch st**.

HIBBERT, HENRY JOHN, Plymouth, Commission Agent Jan 31 **Spence, Plymouth**.

HUGHES, JOHN, Degway, Carnarvon Jan 5 **Hughes, Carnarvon**.

FOSTER, MARY ELIZABETH ISABELLA, Knotty Ash, Liverpool Jan 15 **Grace & Co, Liverpool**.

FRASER, JAMES, Sutton Coldfield, Warwick Jan 31 **Crookford, Birmingham**.

LEIGH, SAMUEL, Newport, I of W, Barge Owner Jan 19 **Bailey, jun, Newport, I of W**.

LINDELL, WILLIAM, Elm pk gds, Artist Jan 21 **Whitfield & Harrison, Surrey st, Strand**.

MATTHEWS, LIES, Simla, Punjab, British India Jan 24 **Fidgate & Co, Craig's et, Charing Cross**.

MELAN, JOSEPH, Fulham pl, Paddington, Joiner Jan 5 **Bold, Swinton nr Manchester**.

MILLS, JOHN, Hatfield rd, Tulse Hill Jan 21 **Miller & Smiths, Selters' Hall et, Cannon st**.

OSWELL, RICHARD, Quariton, nr Bolton Dec 31 **Robinson, Blackpool**.

PARSONS, HENRY JOHN DORNE, Exeter, Land Agent Feb 1 **James & Snow, Exeter**.

RATLIFFE, BERNARD EDWARD, Lime grove, Shepherd's Bush Jan 31 **Pears & Co, Albemarle st**.

SHAWYNS, JAMES, South Shields Dec 19 **Hannay & Co, South Shields**.

SMITH, JOHN HUDSON, Clifton, Bristol, Chartered Accountant Jan 14 **Sturge, Bristol**.

STEVENS, GEORGE, Southsea, Portsmouth Jan 15 **Wool & Robins, Portsmouth**.

THOMAS, LYDIA ELIZA, Preston, nr Harrow, Lodging house Keeper Jan 19 **Johnson & Son, Gray's inn sq**.

TINKER, THOMAS, Long acre Jan 1 **Holdsworth & Payne, Sergeant's inn, Temple**.

VALENTINE, PHILIP, North cres, Bedford sq, Publisher Jan 31 **Robinson & Co, Raymond bldg, Gray's inn**.

WRIGHT, ELIZABETH, Birkdale, Southport Jan 11 **Payne & Co, Manchester**.

Bankruptcy Notices.

London Gazette, TUESDAY, Dec. 4.
ADJUDICATIONS.

ALLUM, DAVID THOMAS, Dunley, nr Stourport, Worcester
Kildminster Pet Nov 30 Ord Nov 30
ANNE, FREDERICK GEORGE HENRY, Portland rd, South
Norwood, Butcher Croydon Pet Nov 21 Ord Nov 21
ANSON, HERBERT, jun, Dresden, Longton, Staffs, China
Merchant Stoke upon Trent Pet Nov 30 Ord Nov 30
BAKER, JOHN, West Morden, Wareham, Dorset, Farmer
Poole Pet Nov 29 Ord Nov 29
BARHAM, HARRY, Norwich, Commercial Clerk Norwich
Pet Nov 29 Ord Nov 29
BARRACLOUGH, JAMES, Bradford, Clerk Bradford Pet
Nov 29 Ord Nov 30
BLIGH, SYDNEY JOHN, 67 Berkhamsted, Herts, Ironmonger
Aylesbury Pet Oct 27 Ord Nov 29
BROAD, CHARLES FREDERICK, Cornhill, Stock Broker High
Court Pet July 27 Ord Nov 29
CATER, GEORGE HERBERT, 67 Woking, Essex, Grocer
Chelmsford Pet Nov 29 Ord Nov 29
CHALLONER, EMILY KATE, Tregothnan rd, Mayflower rd,
Clapham High Court Pet Oct 17 Ord Nov 29
CHALLONER, RICHARD NELSON, Tregothnan rd, Mayflower
rd, Clapham High Court Pet Oct 17 Ord Nov 29
CHILVER, ERNEST, Elderby, Yorks, Wheelwright Kingston
upon Hull Pet Dec 1 Ord Dec 1
CLARKE, ALFRED HENRY, Bristol, Painter Bristol Pet Nov
23 Ord Nov 23
COHEN, LEAH, High st, Kingsland, Fruiterer High Court
Pet Oct 17 Ord Nov 27
CUNNINGHAM, THOMAS ATYSCOUGH, and WALTER STANLEY
GIBSON, 67 Grimsby, Paint Manufacturers 67 Grimsby
Pet Nov 30 Ord Nov 30
DART, ALBERT ERNEST, Brisham, Devon, Tobaccoist Plym-
outh Pet Nov 29 Ord Nov 29
DAVIES, SAMUEL, Plas Morfa, Holywell, Flint, General Mer-
chant Chester Pet Oct 20 Ord Nov 30
EDWARDS, WILLIAM, Pontyrryl, Glam, Collier Cardiff Pet
Nov 25 Ord Nov 25
FELGATE, PERCY ST GEORGE, Cambridge parade, East
Twickenham, Commercial Traveller Brentford Pet
Oct 11 Ord Nov 27
FOOT, WILLIAM JOHN, Bournemouth, Boarding House
Keeper Poole Pet Dec 1 Ord Dec 1
FRAMPTON, ALBERT TOM, King st, West Smithfield High
Court Pet Nov 10 Ord Nov 30
FRANK, HENRY ALFONSO, Sutton st, Shadwell, Tobacco
Dealer High Court Pet Oct 20 Ord Nov 30
FERR, THOMAS, Bristol, Contractor Bristol Pet Nov 22
Ord Nov 22
FREEMAN, JOHN WILLIAM, Hare st, Bethnal Green,
Publican's Manager High Court Pet Nov 30 Ord
Nov 30
FROST, DAVID, St Mark's st, Goodman's Fields High Court
Pet Oct 18 Ord Dec 1
GABNER, FREDERICK JOHN, Northampton, Baker North-
ampton Pet Dec 1 Ord Dec 1
GOLDREID, ABRAHAM, Underwood st, Mile End, Mantle
Manufacturer High Court Pet Nov 19 Ord Nov 30
GORE, THOMAS, Wigan, Traveller Wigan Pet Nov 30 Ord
Nov 30
HARVEY, AMBROSE, Dover, Fruiterer Canterbury Pet
Nov 26 Ord Nov 29
HEATH, NORMAN, Starwix, nr Carlisle, Grocer Carlisle
Pet Nov 29 Ord Nov 29
HEWES, ARTHUR, Stafford Burton on Trent Pet Nov 29
Ord Dec 1
HETWOOD, JOHN, Exeter, Haulier Exeter Pet Nov 30
Ord Nov 30
IVISON, HENRY THOMAS, Teddington, Horse Dealer
Kingston, Surrey Pet Nov 24 Ord Dec 1
JULIAN, JOHN WILLIAM, Boston, Auctioneer Boston Pet
Dec 1 Ord Dec 1
KEW, ALFRED, Charter Alley, nr Basingstoke, Builder
Winchester Pet Nov 30 Ord Nov 30
LIGHTSTREET, ANTHONY, Higher Broughton, Salford, Lancs,
Jeweller Salford Pet Nov 30 Ord Nov 30
MARRIOTT, CHARLES, and PERCY SALTERS, Caterham Valley,
Builders Croydon Pet Sept 26 Ord Nov 26
PEARL, DAVID, and DOROTHY SIMMONDS, Roundabout,
Merchants High Court Pet Oct 12 Ord Nov 30
PRICE, ELLIS, Yaxshir, Glam, Collier Pontypridd Pet
Nov 29 Ord Nov 29
ROBERTS, JOHN, Tynydd, Rhewl, Llanyrys, Denbigh,
Builder Wrexham Pet Nov 29 Ord Nov 29
SLIPCO, WILLIAM SAMSON, Whyteleaf, Surrey, Newagent
Guildford Pet Oct 16 Ord Nov 23
SMITH, ALEXANDER, Twickenham, Builder Brentford
Pet Aug 28 Ord Nov 30
SWAN, HASOLD CHARLES, and ARTHUR EDWARD SWAN
Edwards sq, Kensington, Builders High Court Pet
Nov 2 Ord Nov 30
TILLOTSON, WILSON, Acreington, Traveller Blackburn
Pet Dec 1 Ord Dec 1
WILLIAMS, HENRY JAMES, 67 Yarmouth, Painter 67
Yarmouth Pet Dec 1 Ord Dec 1
WRIGHT, ALFRED, and GEORGE EDWARD WRIGHT, Queens-
ferry, Flint Stone Masons Chester Pet Nov 17 Ord
Dec 1

London Gazette.—FRIDAY, Dec. 7.

RECEIVING ORDERS.

ANALL, FREDERICK, Moss Side, Manchester Salford Pet
Nov 30 Ord Dec 4
AKROYD, JOHN, Halifax, Bootmaker Halifax Pet Nov 30
Ord Nov 30
ASPINWELL, AARON, Whittington, Lancs, Optician Man-
chester Pet Dec 5 Ord Dec 5
BATE, FREDERICK, Liverpool, Stockbroker Liverpool Pet
Dec 5 Ord Dec 5
BICKHAM, JOHN, and JAMES BICKHAM, Glamorgan, Builders
Pontypridd Pet Dec 5 Ord Dec 5
CHAMBERS, WILLIAM, Soho st, Oxford st High Court Pet
Sept 15 Ord Dec 4
CRADDOCK, CAPTAIN WILLIAM, Croydon, Butcher Croydon
Pet Dec 8 Ord Dec 8

CLARKE, CHARLES HERBERT, Nottingham Nottingham
Pet Dec 5 Ord Dec 5
CLAYTON, WILLIAM, Lutterworth, Leicester, Saddler
Leicester Pet Dec 4 Ord Dec 4
CUNNINGHAM, HARRY, Shotton, Flint, Innkeeper Chester
Pet Dec 3 Ord Dec 3
DALE, RICHARD BOXALL, Horsham, Coal Merchant
Brighton Pet Dec 5 Ord Dec 5
DAVIES, RICHARD, Llewellyn Hafod Ucha, Penmachno,
Carmarvon, Farmer Portmadoc Pet Dec 5 Ord Dec 5
DISNEY, GEORGE WILLIAM, Beeston, Notts, Builder Derby
Pet Dec 4 Ord Dec 4
DOBSON, WILLIAM, Maxton, Dover, General Shopkeeper
Canterbury Pet Dec 5 Ord Dec 5
EDWARDS, CHARLES, Rusholme, Manchester, Packing Case
Maker Manchester Pet Nov 30 Ord Dec 3
ELLIS, HOBBA TART, Brindle Heath, Pendleton, Salford,
Lancs, Tailor Wolverhampton Pet Dec 4 Ord Dec 4
EVANS, JOHN, Pentremawd, Morriston, Swansea, Tin-
worker Swansea Pet Dec 3 Ord Dec 3
FISHER, HENRY CHARLES, Wisbech St Peter, Isle of Ely,
Cambridge, Station Master King's Lynn Pet Dec 3
Ord Dec 3
GRAY, JAMES CUNNING, Frodsham, Chester, Car Proprietor
Warrington Pet Dec 4 Ord Dec 4
GROVE, THOMAS HUBERT, Winterbourne, Glos, General
Shopkeeper Bristol Pet Nov 22 Ord Dec 5
HALSEY, WILLIAM, Bradford, Fish Merchant Bradford
Pet Dec 5 Ord Dec 5
HALLAM, SAM, Stonebroom, Shirland, Derby, Joiner Derby
Pet Dec 3 Ord Dec 3
HEAP, LUKE, Thornton, Bradford, Quaysman Bradford
Pet Dec 4 Ord Dec 4
HODDER, FRANK CHURCH, Weymouth, Grocer Dorchester
Pet Dec 5 Ord Dec 5
JONES, DAVID, Bronafon, Llansantffraid, Montgomery,
Faiher Newtown Pet Dec 4 Ord Dec 4
JONES, THOMAS, Dowlais, Glam, Tailor Merthyr Tydfil
Pet Dec 3 Ord Dec 3
LAMBERT, CAPTAIN, Charing Cross House, Charing Cross rd,
Newspaper Proprietor High Court Pet Sept 24 Ord
Oct Dec 5
LEWIS, DAVID JOHN, Oswestry, Stationer Wrexham Pet
Dec 4 Ord Dec 4
LEWIS, SYDNEY RUSSELL, and ROBERT HEWARD DEANE,
Hounslow, Brewers Brentford Pet Dec 4 Ord Dec 4
LOGG, PETER, Leeds Leeds Pet Dec 1 Ord Dec 1
LONGBOTTON, JOHN CHARLES, Gainsborough, Lincs, Milk-
seller Lincoln Pet Dec 4 Ord Dec 4
MACE, ALFRED JOHN, Derby, Restaurant Keeper Derby
Pet Dec 3 Ord Dec 3
MEGROAT, JOHN EDWARD, Newcastle on Tyne, Grocer
Newcastle on Tyne Pet Dec 4 Ord Dec 4
MEGROAT, THOMAS, Woodhouse, Leeds, Joiner Leeds
Pet Dec 3 Ord Dec 3
NAPIER, BENJAMIN, Brighton, Builder Brighton Pet Dec
4 Ord Dec 4
NEVITT, WILLIAM HENRY, Smallbrook Farm, Whitechurch,
Salop, Farmer Pet Dec 4 Ord Dec 4
PHILLIPS, DAVID, Llanelly, Carmarthen, Moulder Car-
marthen Pet Dec 3 Ord Dec 3
SPANAN, HARRY, Doncaster, Tailor Sheffield Pet Dec 3
Ord Dec 3
TERAHER, WILLIAM, Cardiff, Haulier Cardiff Pet Dec 3
Ord Dec 3
VERNON, CHARLES FREDERICK, Lordship rd, Stoke Newing-
ton, Coal Merchant Edmonton Pet Nov 28 Ord Nov 30
WEISS, EUGENE, Basinghall st, Importer of Goods High
Court Pet Nov 14 Ord Dec 3
WERTHEIMER, CHARLES HERMAN, Cleveland st, Dealer in
Motor Accessories High Court Pet Nov 9 Ord Dec 3
WHEADON, THOMAS ROBERT, Black Torrington, nr High-
ampton, Devon, Schoolmaster Barnstaple Pet Dec 3
Ord Dec 3
WILLIAMS, THOMAS, Llanelly, Carmarthen, Draper Car-
marthen Pet Nov 28 Ord Dec 3
WILSON, JOHN, Kingston upon Hull, Machinist Kingston
upon Hull Pet Dec 5 Ord Dec 5
WISE, JOHN WILLIAM, Southampton, Fancy Goods Dealer
Southampton Pet Nov 10 Ord Dec 5
WOOD, JOHN HENRY, Rhyl, Flint, Licensed Victualler
Bangor Pet Dec 8 Ord Dec 3
WRIGHT, HARRY, Penny Stratford, Bucks, Butcher North-
ampton Pet Dec 4 Ord Dec 4

FIRST MEETINGS.

ALFROVICH, JULIUS, Landport, Hants, Furniture Dealer
Dec 17 at 3 Off Rec, Cambridge junc, High st, Port-
smouth
ANSON, HERBERT, jun, Dresden, Longton, Staffs, China
Merchant Dec 17 at 3 Off Rec, King st, Newcastle,
Staffs
BANKES, SUTHERLAND HAMMOOD, Neston, Chester Dec 18
at 12 Off Rec, 39, Victoria st, Liverpool
BRACKENBURY, JOSEPH, Burton on Trent, Malster Dec 18
at 11 Midland Hotel, Station rd, Burton on Trent
BRIDGE, THOMAS HENRY, West Heathley, Sussex, Grocer
Dec 17 at 11.30 Mr C J Parris, 67, High st, Tunbridge
Wells
BROOKLY, JOHN, Chadwick End, Knowle, Warwick, Builder
Dec 17 at 11 191, Corporation st, Birmingham
CHAMBERS, WILLIAM, Soho st, Oxford st Dec 18 at 12
Bankruptcy bldg, Carey st
CHILVER, ERNEST, Elderby, Yorks, Joiner Dec 15 at 11
Off Rec, Trinity House, Hull
CLAYTON, THOMAS, Ashington, Sussex, Farmer Dec 20 at
2.30 Off Rec, 4, Pavilion bldg, Brighton
COPESTAKE, JOHN DANIEL, Florence, Longton, Staffs,
Grocer Dec 17 at 3.30 Off Rec, King st, Newcastle,
Staffs
DAVIES, SAMUEL, Plas Morfa, Holywell, Flint, General
Merchant Dec 17 at 12 Crypt chambers, Eastgate rd,
Chester
DEMBOND-HAY, JAMES CHARLES CHAPMAN, Brighton,
Private School Proprietor Dec 27 at 3 Off Rec, 4,
Pavilion bldg, Brighton
EDWARDS, WILLIAM, Pontyrryl, Glam, Collier Dec 19 at 3
Off Rec, 117, St Mary st, Cardiff
EVANS, JOHN, Pentremawd, Morriston, Tin Worker Dec
17 at 12 Off Rec, 31, Alexandra rd, Swansea

FELAT, JOHN, Byker, Newcastle on Tyne, Grocer Dec 17
at 11 Off Rec, 30, Mosley st, Newcastle on Tyne
FISHER, HENRY CHARLES, Wisbech St Peter, Isle of Ely,
Cambridge, Station Master Dec 30 at 10.15 Court
House, King's Lynn
FOOT, WILLIAM JOHN, Bournemouth, Boarding House
Keeper Dec 17 at 4 Messrs Curtis & Son, 138, Old
Christchurch rd, Bournemouth
GOODMAN, F. N., Goswell rd, Jeweller Dec 18 at 11 Bank-
ruptcy bldg, Carey st
GORE, THOMAS, Wigan, Lancs, Traveller Dec 18 at 1.30
Court House, Crawford st, Wigan
HALL, WILLIAM WALTER, Rolleston, Notts, Engineer Dec
19 at 11 Off Rec, 4, Castle pl, Park st, Nottingham
HALLAM, SAM, Stonebroom, Shirland, Derby, Joiner Dec 18
at 11 Off Rec, 47, Full st, Derby
HARRIS, ARTHUR WALTER, Swanwick, Alfreton, Derby,
Grocer Dec 18 at 3 Off Rec, 47, Full st, Derby
HEAP, LUKE, Thornton, Bradford, Quaysman Dec 18 at 3
Off Rec, 29, Tyrril st, Bradford
HENDERSON, CHARLES ARCHIBALD, Red Lion sq, Machinery
Merchant Dec 17 at 2.30 Bankruptcy bldg, Carey st
IVISON, HENRY THOMAS, Chesham, Bucks, Saddler
Horse Dealer Dec 18 at 11.30 132, York rd, West-
minster Bridge
JONES, ELIZABETH MORRIS, Barmouth, Merioneth Dec 19
at 1 Townhall, Aberystwyth
JONES, THOMAS, Dowlais, Glam, Tailor Dec 17 at 3 135,
High st, Merthyr Tydfil
JULIAN, JOHN WILLIAM, Boston, Auctioneer Dec 20 at
12.15 Off Rec, 4 and 6, West st, Boston
KEW, ALFRED, Charter Alley, nr Basingstoke, Builder
Dec 15 at 12 Station Hotel, Basingstoke
LEVYAND, THOMAS LANGLEY, Trammere, Cheshire, Pawn-
broker Dec 17 at 2.30 Off Rec, 35, Victoria st, Liver-
pool
LOGG, PETER, Leeds Dec 17 at 11 Off Rec, 22, Park row,
Leeds
MEGROAT, JOHN EDWARD, Newcastle on Tyne, Grocer
Dec 18 at 11 Off Rec, 30, Mosley st, Newcastle on Tyne
MILAND, JOHN WILLIAM, Leverington, Cambridge, Grocer
Dec 20 at 10 Court House, King's Lynn
MORLEY, STUART, Goswell rd, Jeweller Dec 18 at 11.30
Bankruptcy bldg, Carey st
MUGGATROYD, THOMAS, Woodhouse, Leeds, Joiner Dec 17
at 11.30 Off Rec, 22, Park row, Leeds
PICKUP, JOSEPH, Furness Alt, nr Oldham, Plate Moulder
Dec 18 at 11 Off Rec, Greaves st, Oldham
SMITH, ALEXANDER, Holmes rd, Twickenham, Builder Dec
17 at 3 14, Bedford row
SMITH, ARTHUR CYRIL GODWIN, Trinity rd, Wandsworth,
Managing Director of Armadale Motors Limited Dec
18 at 12.30 192, York rd, Westminster Bridge
STAPLES, GEORGE WALLACE, Waterloo, Bredon, Worcester,
Market Gardener Dec 15 at 3.15 County Court bldg,
Cheltenham
TERWANTHA, LUCY, and ROBERT TERWANTHA, St Dominic,
Cornwall, Farmers Dec 17 at 11 Off Rec, 6,
Athenum ter, Plymouth
WARDLE, WILLIAM WALLACE, Hanley, Staffs, Potter's
Colour Mixer Dec 18 at 3.30 Off Rec, King st, New-
castle, Staffs
WEISS, EUGENE, Basinghall st, Importer of Goods Dec 19
at 11 Bankruptcy bldg, Carey st
WERTHEIMER, CHARLES HERMAN, Cleveland st, Boston rd,
Dealer in Motor Accessories Dec 17 at 12 Bankruptcy
bldg, Carey st
WHEADON, THOMAS ROBERT, Black Torrington, nr High-
ampton, Devon, Schoolmaster Dec 1 at 3 94, High
st, Barnstaple
WILLS, WILLIAM JOHN, and ARTHUR EDWARD ISOHONGER
SOLA, The Mall, Ealing, Contractors Dec 17 at 12
14, Bedford row

Amended notice substituted for that published in the
London Gazette of Nov 27:

VAVASOUR, SIR WILLIAM, Tadcaster, Yorks Dec 20 at 3
Off Rec, The Red House, Duncombe pl, York

ADJUDICATIONS.

AKROYD, JOHN, Halifax, Boot Maker Halifax Pet Nov
30 Ord Nov 30
AILEY, CHARLES, Upper George st, Marylebone, Horsedealer
High Court Pet Oct 18 Ord Dec 4
BARNATT, ALFRED, Sate rd, West Hampstead High Court
Pet Sept 29 Ord Dec 5
BATH, FREDERICK, Liverpool, Stock Broker Liverpool
Pet Dec 5 Ord Dec 5
BICKHAM, JOHN, and JAMES BICKHAM, Glamorgan, Builders
Pontypridd Pet Dec 5 Ord Dec 5
BLACKMAN, EDWARD WILLIAM, Hamlet gdns, Hammersmith
High Court Pet Oct 17 Ord Dec 4
BRIDGE, ALEXANDER KING, Kingley st, Regent st High
Court Pet Nov 5 Ord Dec 3
CAYERS, AEF, Mowry Park, Trammere, Cheshire, Licensed
Victualler Birkenhead Pet Oct 15 Ord Dec 5
CHANDLER, CAPTAIN WILLIAM, Croydon, Butcher Croydon
Pet Dec 3 Ord Dec 3
CLARKE, CHARLES HERBERT, Nottingham Nottingham
Pet Dec 5 Ord Dec 5
DALE, RICHARD BOXALL, Horsham, Coal Merchant
Brighton Pet Dec 5 Ord Dec 5
DAVIES, RICHARD, Penmachno, Carmarvon, Farmer Port-
madoc Pet Dec 5 Ord Dec 5
DISNEY, GEORGE WILLIAM, Beeston, Notts, Builder Derby
Pet Dec 4 Ord Dec 4
DOBSON, WILLIAM, Maxton, Dover, General Shopkeeper
Canterbury Pet Dec 5 Ord Dec 5
ELLIS, HOBBA TART, Brindle Heath, Pendleton, Salford,
Lancs, Tailor Wolverhampton Pet Dec 4 Ord Dec 4
EVANS, JOHN, Pentremawd, Morriston, Swansea, Tin-
worker Swansea Pet Dec 3 Ord Dec 3
EVANS, HENRY CHARLES, Birmingham, Grocer Birming-
ham Pet Oct 17 Ord Dec 3
FISHER, HENRY CHARLES, Wisbech St Peter, Isle of Ely,
Cambridge, Station Master King's Lynn Pet Dec 3
Ord Dec 3
FOSTER, FREDERICK EDWARD, and ALFRED GOTLIEB
FOSTER, Monument st, Coal Merchants High Court
Pet Oct 30 Ord Nov 30

GRAY, JAMES CUMMING, Frodsham, Chester, Car Proprietor
Warrington Pet Dec 4 Ord Dec 4
HALSEY, WILLIAM, Fife, Bradford, Fish Merchant Bradford
Pet Dec 5 Ord Dec 5
HALLAM, SAM, Stonebroom, Ehliland, Derby, Joiner Derby
Pet Dec 3 Ord Dec 3
HEAP, LUKE, Thornton, Bradford, Quarryman Bradford
Pet Dec 4 Ord Dec 4
HODDER, FRANCIS CHARLES, Weymouth, Grocer Dorchester
Pet Dec 5 Ord Dec 5
HUNT, WALTER SYDNEY, Castlenau, Barnes, Chartered
Accountant High Court Pet Oct 24 Ord Nov 30
JACOBSON, ABRAHAM, and WOLFF LEATHERMAN, Leeds,
Clothing Leeds Pet Oct 27 Ord Dec 5
JONES, DAVID, Bransford, Llanidfafridd, Montgomery,
Farmer Newtown Pet Dec 4 Ord Dec 4
JONES, THOMAS, Dowlais, Glam, Tailor Merthyr Tydfil
Pet Dec 3 Ord Dec 3
LEWIS, DAVID JOHN, Oswestry, Salop Stationer Wrexham
Pet Dec 4 Ord Dec 4
LEYLAND, THOMAS LANGLEY, Trammer, Cheshire, Pawn-
broker Birkenhead Pet Nov 30 Ord Dec 5
LOO, PETER, Leeds Leeds Pet Dec 1 Ord Dec 1
LONGBRITTON, JOHN CHARLES, Gainsborough, Lincs, Milk
seller Lincoln Pet Dec 4 Ord Dec 4
MACE, ALFRED JOHN, Sadler gate, Derby, Restaurant
Keeper Derby Pet Dec 3 Ord Dec 3
MARTIN, JACOB ADAM, Hazlewood mans, Rostrevor rd,
Fulham, Publican High Court Pet Nov 2 Ord
Dec 5
MEADOWS, JOHN EDWARD, Newcastle on Tyne, Grocer
Newcastle on Tyne Pet Dec 4 Ord Dec 4
MEURATROYD, THOMAS, Woodhouse, Leeds, Joiner Leeds
Pet Dec 3 Ord Dec 3
NAVER, BENJAMIN, Brighton, Builder Brighton Pet Dec
4 Ord Dec 4
NAVIT, WILLIAM HENRY, Whitechurch, Salop, Farmer
Crewe Pet Dec 4 Ord Dec 4
PETTIBREW, JAMES WILLIAM, Ealing, Jeweller Brentford
Pet Nov 2 Ord Dec 3
PHILLIPS, DAVID, Llanelly, Carmarthen, Moulder Carmar-
then Pet Dec 3 Ord Dec 3
REVER, JOHN EDWARD, Hemist rd, Cannock Town,
Photographer High Court Pet Oct 20 Ord Dec 5
SEAMAN, HARRY, Wheatley, Doncaster, Tailor Sheffield
Pet Dec 3 Ord Dec 3
THOM, FREDERICK, Fishponds, Bristol Bristol Pet Nov 23
Ord Dec 5
TERASHER, WILLIAM, Cardiff, Coal Dealer Cardiff Pet
Dec 3 Ord Dec 3
VENOR, CHARLES FREDERICK, Lordship rd, Stoke
Newington, Coal Merchant Edmonton Pet Nov 29
Ord Nov 30
WEADON, THOMAS ROBERT, Black Torrington, nr
Highampton, Devon, Schoolmaster Barnstaple Pet
Dec 3 Ord Dec 3
WILLIAMS, THOMAS, Llanelly, Carmarthen, Draper Car-
marthen Pet Nov 28 Ord Dec 3
WILSON, J. H., Kingston upon Hull, Tobacconist Kings' on
Hull Pet Dec 5 Ord Dec 5
WOOL, JOHN HENRY, Rhyl, Flint, Licensed Victualler
Bangor Pet Dec 3 Ord Dec 5

Amended notice substituted for that published in the
London Gazette of Nov 13:

BOOTH, LOUIE RACHAEL, Stockton on Tees, Milliner Stock-
ton on Tees Pet Nov 9 Ord Nov 9

London Gazette, -Tuesday, Dec. 11.

RECEIVING ORDERS.

ALLITT, HORACE, Wisbech, Cambridge King's Lynn Pet
Dec 6 Ord Dec 6
ASTON, JOHN GROFFERT, Southport, Stock Broker
Manchester Pet Dec 8 Ord Dec 3
BAKER, HENRY BEAV, Waltham Abbey, Essex, Dairy
Farmer Edmonton Pet Dec 6 Ord Dec 6
BOLTON, IYV JANE MARGARET, Helmingly, Sussex East-
bourne Ord Dec 6
BUTLER, WILLIAM, HORACE BUTLER, SAMUEL MARTIN, and
WILLIAM MARTIN, Willenhall, Staffs, Stampers
Wolverhampton Pet Dec 6 Ord Dec 6
COOPER, ARTHUR EDWITT, Pendleton, Salford, Provision
Manufacturer Salford Pet Dec 7 Ord Dec 7
DIGGLE, JOSEPH, Bury, Lancs Bolton Pet Dec 6 Ord
Dec 6
FALKNER, ALFRED BRACH, Osney rd, Old Kent rd, Builder
High Court Pet Dec 6 Ord Dec 6
FARRAR, JOSEPH PRESTON, Greenheys, Manchester, Builder
Manchester Pet Dec 7 Ord Dec 7
FELAY, JOHN, Byker, Newcastle on Tyne, Grocer New-
castle on Tyne Pet Nov 17 Ord Dec 6
FOXGROFT, ELIZABETH ALICE, Blackpool, Wardrobe Dealer
Preston Pet Nov 18 Ord Dec 7
FULWELL, HANNAH, and GEORGE HERBERT FULWELL,
Stourbridge, Cab Proprietors Stourbridge Pet Dec 8
Ord Dec 8
GODDARD, JOHN RIDGELL, Seaton, Devon, Stationer
Exeter Pet Dec 5 Ord Dec 5
HARRISON, TOM WILLIAM, Caistor, Lincs, Labourer Lincoln
Pet Dec 8 Ord Dec 8
HETHERINGTON, BARKER THOMAS, Warwick, nr Carlisle,
Auctioneer Carlisle Pet Dec 8 Ord Dec 8
HILL, CHARLES GRAY, South pl, Finsbury, Builder High
Court Pet Dec 8 Ord Dec 8
HOFFMAN, MAURICE HERBERT, Morat st, Brixton, Theatrical
Manager High Court Pet Dec 8 Ord Dec 8
HOLT, HERBERT CHRYSTON, Rhyl, Flint, Electrical Engineer
Bangor Pet Dec 9 Ord Dec 6
HUNT, KORA CHARLOTTE, Earl's Court sq, Spinster High
Court Pet Nov 13 Ord Dec 7
JACOBSON, HYMAN, Commercial rd, Clothier High Court
Pet Nov 19 Ord Dec 7
JAMES, WILLIAM, Llandre Farm, Llanycefa, Pembroke,
Farmer Pembroke Dock Pet Dec 8 Ord Dec 8
JESSEL, FRANK HERBERT, Brighton, Journalist Brighton
Pet Dec 6 Ord Dec 6
JONES, JOHN RICHARD, Shanklin, I of W, Tailor Newport
and Ryde Pet Dec 6 Ord Dec 6
KIRK, CHRISTOPHER, Middlebrough, Warehouseman
Middlebrough Pet Dec 6 Ord Dec 6

LOVATT, WILLIAM, Biddulph, Staffs, Builder Macclesfield
Pet Dec 5 Ord Dec 5
LOWE, JOEL, Attercliffe, Sheffield, Builder Sheffield Pet
Dec 7 Ord Dec 7
MAJOR, HENRY, Folkestone, Confectioner Canterbury Pet
Dec 6 Ord Dec 6
NEALE, JOHN HENRY, Elgin et, Elgin av, Insurance
Broker High Court Pet Dec 8 Ord Dec 8
PICKIN, WILLIAM JOHN, Berthamsted, Herts, Solicitor
Aylesbury Pet Nov 17 Ord Dec 7
POWELL, WILLIAM RICHARD, Ryton, nr Shifnal, Salop
Farmer Madeley Pet Nov 30 Ord Dec 7
RAVENSCROFT, BIRKBECK, St Albans St Albans Pet Oct 12
Ord Dec 4
RAYNER, FRED, Bradford, Insurance Agent Bradford Pet
Dec 5 Ord Dec 5
SALT, GEORGE HENRY, Newcastle under Lyne, Saddler
Leicester Pet Dec 7 Ord Dec 7
SHAW, WILLIAM, King's rd, Chelsea, Chemist High Court
Pet Dec 7 Ord Dec 7
SIMON, A, Bethnal Green rd High Court Pet Nov 17 Ord
Dec 6
SISLEY, JOHN WILLIAM, St Leonards on Sea, Poulterer
Hastings Pet Dec 6 Ord Dec 6
STRANGE, CHARLES EDWARD, Oadby, Leicester, Builder
Leicester Pet Dec 7 Ord Dec 7
STUBBINGS, ARTHUR, Norwich, Harness Maker Norwich
Pet Dec 8 Ord Dec 8
TATTON, FRANK, Chiswick, Solicitor High Court Pet Sept
25 Ord Dec 6
THOMAS, JOHN, Abercrombie, Merthyr Tydfil, Collier
Merthyr Tydfil Pet Dec 8 Ord Dec 8
WATMOUGH, JONATHAN, Gt Horton, Bradford, Coal Mer-
chant Bradford Pet Nov 31 Ord Dec 7
WILLIAMS, DAVID, Penrthwether, Glam, Tailor Ponty-
pridd Pet Dec 7 Ord Dec 7
WILLINGS, KATE, Leeds Leeds Pet Nov 24 Ord Dec 7
WILSON, WILLIAM JACOB, Birmingham Birmingham Pet
Dec 7 Ord Dec 7
WOLFE, HYMAN, Leeds, Milk Dealer Leeds Pet Dec 6
Ord Dec 6

FIRST MEETINGS.

AKROYD, JOHN, Halifax, Boot Maker Dec 19 at 3 Off Rec,
Townhall chambers, Halifax
AMER, FREDERICK GEORGE HENRY, Portland rd, South
Norwood, Butcher Dec 19 at 11.30 132, York rd,
Westminster Bridge
ARONBERG, AARON, Withington, Lancs, Optician Dec 20
at 2.30 Off Rec, Byrom st, Manchester
BAKER, HARRY BLAY, Waltham Abbey, Essex, Dairy
Farmer Dec 19 at 3 14, Bedford row
BICKHAM, JOHN, and JAMES BICKHAM, Glamorgan, Builders
Dec 19 at 3 133, High st, Merthyr Tydfil
CASBURN, WALTER, Bangor, Provision Merchant Dec 19
at 12 Crypt chambers, Eastgate row, Chester
CATER, GEORGE HERBERT, Gt Wakering, Essex, Grocer
Dec 20 at 12, Bedford row
CHADDLER, CERNUS WILLIAM, Cryolton, Butcher Dec 21
at 11.30 132, York rd, Westminster Bridge
CHAFFMAN, CECIL SUTTON, Blackheath, Lieutenant Dec 20 at
11.30 132, York rd, Westminster Bridge
COATES, WILLIAM, Longridge, nr Preston, Lancs, Plumber
Dec 19 at 11 Off Rec, 14, Chapel st, Preston
DALE, RICHARD BOXALL, Hornham, Coal Merchant Dec 20
at 3.15 Off Rec, 4, Pavilion bldgs, Brighton
DART, ALBERT ERNEST, Brighthelm, Devon, Tobacconist Dec
20 at 11.30 Off Rec, 6, Atheneum ter, Plymouth
DIGGLE, JOSEPH, Bury, Lancs Dec 20 at 3 10, Exchange st,
Bolton
EVANS, THOMAS, Penycu, Raddon, Denbigh, Grocer Dec
21 at 12.30 Crypt chambers, Eastgate row, Chester
FALKNER, ALFRED BRACH, Osney rd, Old Kent rd, Builder
Dec 20 at 2.30 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st
FALTON, GEORGE, Wrexham, Denbigh, Baker Dec 21 at 12
Crypt chambers, Eastgate row, Chester
GARNER, FREDERICK JOHN, Northampton, Baker Dec 19 at
12 Off Rec, Bridge st, Northampton
GODDARD, JOHN RIDGELL, Seaton, Devon, Stationer Dec
20 at 10.30 Off Rec, 9, Bedford circus, Exeter
GRAY, JAMES CUMMING, Frodsham, Chester, Car Proprietor
Dec 19 at 3.30 Off Rec, Byrom st, Manchester
GROVE, THOMAS HUBERT, Winterbourne, Glos, General
Shopkeeper Dec 19 at 11.45 Off Rec, 20, Baldwin st,
Bristol
GREEN, H M, Feltham Dec 20 at 12.30 132, York rd,
Westminster Bridge
HALSEY, WILLIAM, Fife, Bradford, Fish Merchant Dec 19
at 5 Off Rec, 25, Tyrol st, Bradford
HARTY, ANDREW, Dover, Fruiterer Dec 20 at 11.45 Off
Rec, 68A, Castle st, Canterbury
HEATH, NORMAN, Stanwick, nr Carlisle, Grocer Dec 21 at 12
Off Rec, 34, Fishor st, Carlisle
HILL, CHARLES GRAY, South pl, Finsbury, Builder and Con-
tractor Dec 19 at 2.30 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st
HODDER, FRANCIS CHARLES, Weymouth, Grocer Dec 20 at 1
Off Rec, City chambers, Catherine st, Salisbury
HOLT, EDNA CHARLOTTE, Earl's Court sq Dec 19 at 2.30
Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st
JACOB, BARNARD NELSON, Coleford, Glos, Clothier Dec 19 at
2.30 Off Rec, 144, Commercial st, Newport, Mon
JACOBSON, HYMAN, Commercial rd, Clothier Dec 19 at 12
Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st
JESSEL, FRANK HERBERT, Brighton, Journalist Dec 20 at
10 Off Rec, 4, Pavilion bldgs, Brighton
JONES, DAVID, Bransford, Llanidfafridd, Montgomery,
Farmer Dec 20 at 11.30 Wynnstay Hotel, Oswestry
JONES, THOMAS, New Brighton, Builder Dec 19 at 12 Off
Rec, 35, Victoria st, Liverpool
KIRK, CHRISTOPHER, Middlebrough, Warehouseman Dec
21 at 12.30 Off Rec, 8, Albert rd, Middlebrough
LANBART, CAPTAIN, Charing Cross rd, Newspaper Proprietor
Dec 19 at 11 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st
LEWIS, SYDNEY RUSSELL, and ROBERT HOWARD DEANE,
Hounslow, Browns Dec 19 at 11 14, Bedford row
LICHNESTEIN, ADOLPH, Higher Brocton, Salford,
Jeweller Dec 19 at 2.30 Off Rec, Byrom st, Man-
chester
MACE, ALFRED JOHN, Sadler gate, Derby, Restaurant Keeper
Dec 19 at 11.30 Off Rec, 47, Full st, Derby

MACRACHINI, ASASTAGIOS, Cardiff, Water Clerk Cardiff Dec 20
at 3 Off Rec, 117, St Mary st, Cardiff
MINSHALL, WILLIAM, Stockport, Drap- Dec 20 at 12.30
Off Rec, Castle chambers, 6, Vernon st, Stockport
NICHOLSON, CHARLES, Blackpool, Commercial Traveller
Dec 19 at 11.15 Off Rec, 14, Chapel st, Preston
PERRINS, FREDERICK CHARLES, Uxbridge rd, West Ealing,
House Furniture Dec 20 at 3 14, Bedford row
PHILLIPS, DAVID, Llanelly, Carmarthen, Moulder Jan
4 at 11.15 Off Rec, 4, Queen st, Carmarthen
POWELL, WILLIAM RICHARD, Ryton, nr Shifnal, Salop,
Farmer Dec 21 at 11.30 Jerningham Arms Hotel,
Shifnal
RAVENSCROFT, BIRKBECK, St Albans, Herts Dec 21 at 12
14, Bedford row
RAYNER, FRED, Bradford, Insurance Agent Dec 19 at 2.30
Off Rec, 25, Tyrol st, Bradford
RHODES, LYLES GORDON, Bramhall, Cheshire, Grammar
School Proprietor Dec 20 at 12 Off Rec, Castle
chambers, 6, Vernon st, Stockport
SALT, GEORGE HENRY, Newcastle under Lyne, Staffs,
Saddler Dec 20 at 12 Off Rec, King st, Newcastle,
Staffordshire
SHAW, WILLIAM, King's rd, Chelsea, Chemist Dec 21 at 11
Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st
SISLEY, A, Bethnal Green rd Dec 20 at 12 Bankruptcy
bldgs, Carey st
SMITH, WILLIAM, Uk, Mon, Licensed Victualler Dec 19 at
12 Off Rec, 144, Commercial st, Newport, Mon
TATTON, FRANK, Prebend glas, Chiswick, Solicitor Dec
20 at 11 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st
THOM, ARTHUR, Hereford Dec 20 at 10 2, Offa st,
Hereford
WATMOUGH, JONATHAN, Gt Horton, Bradford, Coal Mer-
chant Dec 20 at 3 Off Rec, Tyrol st, Bradford
WILLIAMS, CHARLES THOMAS, Baginbun, Wicks, Glos,
Hay Dealer Dec 19 at 11.30 Off Rec, 25, Baldwin
st, Bristol
WILLIAMS, DAVID, Penrthwether, Glam, Tailor Dec 20 at
12 135, High st, Merthyr Tydfil
WILLIAMS, HENRY JAMES, Gt Yarmouth, Painter Dec 19
at 3.30 Off Rec, 5, King st, Norwich
WILLIAMS, HUGH, Trammer, Cheshire, Builder Dec 19 at
2.30 Off Rec, 25, Victoria st, Liverpool
WILLIAMS, THOMAS, Llanelly, Carmarthen, Draper Dec 21
at 12 Off Rec, 31, Alexandra rd, Swansea
WILLINGS, KATE, Leeds Dec 19 at 11.30 Off Rec, 22, Park
row, Leeds
WILSON, JOHN, Kingston upon Hull, Machinist Dec 19 at
11 Off Rec, Trinity House in, Hull
WISK, JOHN WILLIAM, Southampton, Fancy Goods Dealer
Dec 19 at 11 Off Rec, 6, Midland Bank chambers, High st,
Southampton
WOLFE, HYMAN, Leeds, Milk Dealer Dec 19 at 11 Off Rec,
22 Park row, Leeds
WOOD, CAROLINE ELIZABETH, Banbury, Dressmaker Dec
19 at 3.30 1, St Aldate's, Oxford
WRIGHT, HARRY, Fenny Stratford, Bucks, Butcher Dec
19 at 12.30 Off Rec, Bridge st, Northampton
YELLAND, JOHN, Callington, Cornwall, Saddler Dec 20 at
11 Off Rec, 6, Atheneum ter, Plymouth

ADJUDICATIONS.

AITCHISON, WILLIAM, Blyth, Northumberland, Painter
Newcastle on Tyne Pet Oct 12 Ord Dec 5
ALLITT, HORACE, Wisbech, Cambridge King's Lynn Pet
Dec 6 Ord Dec 6
ARONBERG, AARON, Withington, Optician Manchester
Pet Dec 5 Ord Dec 5
ASTON, JOHN GROFFERT, Southport, Stock Broker Man-
chester Pet Dec 8 Ord Dec 8
CLAYTON, THOMAS, Ashington, Sussex, Farmer Brighton
Pet Oct 12 Ord Dec 6
CURRIER, HARRY, Shotton, Flint, Innkeeper Chester
Pet Dec 8 Ord Dec 6
DIAMANT, HERBERT, Victoria rd, Kilburn High Court
Pet Sept 6 Ord Dec 7
DIGGLE, JOSEPH, Bury, Lancs Bolton Pet Dec 6 Ord
Dec 6
FARRAR, JOSEPH PRESTON, Greenheys, Manchester, Builder
Manchester Pet Dec 7 Ord Dec 7
FULWELL, HANNAH, and GEORGE HERBERT FULWELL,
Stourbridge, Worcester, Cab Proprietors Stourbridge
Pet Dec 8 Ord Dec 8
GODDARD, JOHN RIDGELL, Seaton, Devon, Stationer Exeter
Pet Dec 5 Ord Dec 5
HARRISON, HUGH ROBERT EDWARD, Cadogan et, Chelsea
High Court Pet Aug 15 Ord Dec 7
HARRISON, TOM WILLIAM, Caistor, Lincs, Labourer Lin-
coln Pet Dec 8 Ord Dec 8
HETHERINGTON, BARKER THOMAS, Warwick, nr Carlisle,
Auctioneer Carlisle Pet Dec 8 Ord Dec 8
HOFFMAN, MAURICE HERBERT, Morat st, Brixton, Theatrical
Manager High Court Pet Dec 8 Ord Dec 8
HOLT, HERBERT CHRYSTON, Rhyl, Electrical Engineer Pet
Dec 8 Ord Dec 8
JAMES, WILLIAM, Llandre Farm, Llanycefa, Pembroke,
Farmer Pembroke Dock Pet Dec 8 Ord Dec 8
JESSEL, FRANK HERBERT, Brighton, Journalist Brighton
Pet Dec 6 Ord Dec 6
JONES, JOHN RICHARD, Shanklin, I of W, Tailor Newport
and Ryde Pet Dec 6 Ord Dec 6
KIRK, CHRISTOPHER, Middlebrough, Warehouseman
Middlebrough Pet Dec 6 Ord Dec 6
LOWE, JOEL, Attercliffe, Sheffield, Builder Sheffield Pet
Dec 7 Ord Dec 7
MACRACHINI, ASASTAGIOS, Cardiff, Water Clerk Cardiff
Pet Oct 25 Ord Dec 8
MAJOR, HENRY, Folkestone, Confectioner Canterbury Pet
Dec 6 Ord Dec 6
NEALE, JOHN HENRY, Elgin et, Elgin av, Insurance Broker
High Court Pet Dec 8 Ord Dec 8
PARRON, LEONARD, Fishponds, Bristol Newnham Bristol
Pet Nov 23 Ord Dec 7
PICKIN, WILLIAM JOHN, Berthamsted, Herts, Solicitor
Aylesbury Pet Nov 17 Ord Dec 7
POTTER, BERNARD WILLIAM, Owa Exchange, Manchester,
Dry Fruit Merchant High Court Pet Nov 6 Ord
Dec 8

RAYNER, FRPD, Bradford, Insurance Agent Bradford Pet Dec 5 Ord Dec 5
 SALT, GEORGE HENRY, Newcastle-under-Lyme, Staffs, Saddler Harley Pet Nov 21 Ord Dec 7
 SHAW, WILLIAM, King's rd, Chelsea, Chemist High Court Pet Dec 7 Ord Dec 7
 SISKET, JOHN WILLIAM, St Leonard's on Sea, Poulterer Hastings Pet Dec 6 Ord Dec 6
 STRANGE, CHARLES EDWARD, Oadby, Leicester Builder Leicester Pet Dec 7 Ord Dec 7
 STUBBINGS, ARTHUR, Norwich, Hainess Maker Norwich Pet Dec 8 Ord Dec 8
 THOMAS JOHN, Abercrombie, Merthyr Tydfil, Collier Merthyr Tydfil Pet Dec 8 Ord Dec 8
 TODD, PHILIP ARTHUR, Church row, Hampstead, Architect High Court Pet Sept 5 Ord Dec 6
 WATMOUGH, JONATHAN, Gt Horton, Bradford, Coal Merchant Bradford Pet Nov 21 Ord Dec 7
 WILLIAMS, CHARLES THOMAS, Bagstone, Wickwar, Glos, Hay Dealer Bristol Pet Dec 1 Ord Dec 6
 WILLIAMS, DAVID, Penrhynweller, Glam, Tailor Pontypridd Pet Dec 7 Ord Dec 7
 WILSON, WILLIAM JACOB, Birmingham Birmingham Pet Dec 7 Ord Dec 7
 WISE, JOHN WILLIAM, Southampton, Fancy Goods Dealer Southampton Pet Nov 10 Pet Dec 7
 WOLFE, HYMAN, Leeds, Milk Dealer Leeds Pet Dec 6 Ord Dec 6
 WOOD, CAROLINE ELIZABETH, Banbury, Oxon, Dressmaker Banbury Pet Nov 24 Ord Dec 8
 WRIGHT, HARRY, Fenny Stratford, Bucks, Butcher Northampton Pet Dec 4 Ord Dec 6

RECEIVING ORDER RESCINDED AND PETITION DISMISSED.

ADAM, MAUGHAN MESSRS, Park st, Grosvenor sq High Court Pet Aug 16 Rec Ord Sept 17 Rec Rec Ord Dis Pet Dec 7

ADJUDICATION ANNULLED.

ELLS, DAX, Woodmanote, Glos, Farmer Cheltenham Adjud Jan 29 Annul Dec 7

LAW PARTNERSHIPS & SUCCESSIONS

For Vacancies for, or introductions to the above, apply to

J. HARCOURT SMITH,

The old-established PARTNERSHIP AGENT.

LAW COSTS DRAFTSMAN, & ACCOUNTANT,

61 & 62, CHANCERY LANE, W.C.
 SHORTHAND CLERK Offered Articles and Salary by City Solicitor.

MR. G. A. BLACKWELL, Barrister-at-Law, LL.B. (Lond.), PREPARES STUDENTS for Solicitors' Intermediate and Final, and for London University Matriculation, Preliminary, Intermediate, and Final LL.B. Exams.; many successes; evening classes.—Apply, 7, Stone-buildings, Lincoln's-inn (two minutes from Tube).

MR. F. F. MONTAGUE, LL.B., continues to PREPARE for the SOLICITORS' FINAL and INTERMEDIATE EXAMINATIONS; payment by result.—Particulars on application, personally or by letter, at 93, Chancery Lane, W.

LAW.—Experienced London Conveyancing Clerk (26) Desires Engagement; Town or Country; good Shorthand and General; eight years' experience; excellent references.—G., 54, Hanover-road, Willesden, N.W.

LAW.—Wanted, by Advertiser, who has had 30 years' experience as a Solicitor's Copying, Engrossing, and General Clerk, a Trial in the same position; a small salary taken.—Address, W. G. W. SLOOGER, 43, Marlborough-road, Chelsea, London.

WANTED, a Solicitor, about 26 years of age, as Assistant to a Solicitor in the Straits Settlements; must be good advocate; five years' engagement; salary 250 dols. per month, rising to 400 dols.—Apply to B., No. 1, Bedford-row, London.

WANTED (for Temporary Appointment, probably for 12 months), by a Firm of Solicitors in London, Managing Clerk (Admitted), thoroughly versed in Chancery and Common Law Practice and Procedure, both in Chambers and in Court; age from 27 to 35; salary at rate of £175 to £200 per annum, according to qualifications.—Apply, by letter only to, B., care of Messrs. Warner, 291, Oxford-street, W.

LAW.—Wanted, by a Firm of City Solicitors, Competent Bill Clerk to work up arrears of and to record current costs and to prepare and settle bills without supervision; Shorthand essential.—Applications, by letter only, with references, and stating experience and salary required, to F. B., care of Messrs. Charles Barker & Sons, 8, Birch-lane, E.C.

AN Established INSURANCE CORPORATION are desirous of APPOINTING SOLICITORS; applications are invited from gentlemen willing to invest £500 in shares of the company for Directorship; remuneration £100 per annum and fees.—Address, SOLICITORS, 165, Messrs. Deacon's, Leadenhall-street, E.C.

CRACKNELL.—Would Norfolk Solicitors who advertised for above four years ago kindly write 17, Heathfield-gardens, Chiswick, W.

TO SOLICITORS, BANKERS, and Others.
 —Catherine Maud Howell, deceased.—Anyone who has any knowledge of a Will having been made by Catherine Maud Howell, of Wandsworth, who died unmarried on the 21st November, 1906, or who may have possession of such Will, is requested to kindly communicate at once with Messrs. KIDDER & BOATHMAN, Solicitors, 79, Lombard-street, London, E.C.

£7,500 Wanted, on 6 per Cent. First Mortgage Debentures, by Old-established Company.—Apply LEX, "Solicitors' Journal and Weekly Reporter" Office, 27, Chancery-lane, W.C.

ENGINEERING BUSINESS.—A good Opening in an old-established Company for a capable man with some experience and small capital; arrangements might be made for a seat on the board if desired.—Apply, in first instance, by letter only, to E. FURNIVAL JONES, Incorporated Accountant, 31, Lombard-street, E.C.

TO COUNTRY SOLICITORS.—Old-established London Solicitor, with convenient first-floor Office in quiet street opposite the Royal Courts, Offers Use of his address to Country Solicitor at inclusive rent.—Box 68, "Solicitors' Journal and Weekly Reporter" Office, 27, Chancery-lane, W.C.

LADY TYPIST (Shorthand), experienced, Requires Engagement.—D., 14, Melrose-gardens, Shepherd's Bush-road, W.

TO EMPLOYERS.—The London and Provincial Legal Bureau, 306, Upper Thames-street, London. Numbers of suitable Clerks always on Register; no fees charged; Clerks Desiring Appointments requested to register.

LAW BOOKS at GREAT REDUCTIONS! —All kinds of Law, Commercial, and other Books supplied. Mostly LATEST EDITIONS. State wants. Send for List. New Books at 25 per cent. Discount. Sent on approval. BOOKS BOUGHT.—W. & G. FOTLE, 130, Charing Cross-road, W.C.

LAW.—GREAT SAVING.—For prompt payment 25 per cent. will be taken off the following writing charges:—

	s.	d.
Abstracts Copied	0	8 per sheet.
Briefs and Drafts	2	3 per 30 folios.
Deeds Round Hand	0	2 per folio.
Deeds Abstracted	2	0 per sheet.
Full Copies	0	2 per folio.

PAPER.—Foolscap, 1d. per sheet; Draft, 3d. ditto; Parchment, 1s. 6d. to 3s. 6d. per skin.

KERR & LANHAM, 16, Fumival-street, Holborn, E.C.

THE LONDON and WESTMINSTER LOAN & DISCOUNT COMPANY (Ltd.) (Est. 1866). Offices: 63, St. Martin's-lane, W.C., & 43, London wall, E.C. ADVANCE MONEY on personal security, furniture, leases, life policies, &c., repayable, INCLUDING INTEREST:—

£10 One Year, Weekly	£0 4 4	Monthly	£0 19 3
£20	"	"	£1 17 6
£30	"	"	£2 16 3
£50	"	"	£4 13 9
£100	"	"	£9 7 6

 Larger sums in proportion. Moderate rates for bills of sale. Prospectus free on application to Secretary (No Agents.)

MONEY.—FROM £50 to £5,000.—Would any responsible Gentleman, in Town or Country, be willing to pay a fair rate of interest for an IMMEDIATE ADVANCE OF CASH upon their own PROMISSORY NOTE, without Security, Publicity, or fees, and strictly private.

Call or write to the Actual Lenders,

J. WESTON & CO.,

30 & 31, DUKE STREET, PICCADILLY, LONDON, W.

ALEXANDER & SHEPHEARD, PRINTERS, LIMITED.

LAW and PARLIAMENTARY.

PARLIAMENTARY BILLS, MINUTES OF EVIDENCE, BOOKS OF REFERENCE, STATEMENTS OF CLAIM, ANSWERS, &c., &c. BOOKS, PAMPHLETS, MAGAZINES, NEWSPAPERS, And all General and Commercial Work. Every description of Printing.

Printers of THE SOLICITORS' JOURNAL AND WEEKLY REPORTER.

NORWICH STREET, FETTER LANE, LONDON, E.C.

ORDER FORM.

190 .

Please send the SOLICITORS' JOURNAL AND WEEKLY REPORTER from

until countermanded. I enclose cheque for _____, my Subscription

for _____ months.

* The SOLICITORS' JOURNAL AND WEEKLY REPORTER can be ordered from any date, and back numbers of the current volume can be supplied.

Cheques and Post Office Orders payable to H. VILLERS.

OFFICE: 27, CHANCERY LANE.

Pro-
rent,
ster:
tested

TS!!
books
auto.
8mi
, 126,

empt
owing

ditto;

, E.C.

2

. 1886).

il, E.C.

leaves,

ST:

19 3

17 6

16 3

13 9

7 6

bills of

7 (25)

- Would

town or

r rate of

CASH

Security,

BILLY.

ARD,

TED.

Books of

Co., &c.

ZINES,

Work.

REPORTER.

DON, E.C.

0 .

NE.